



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2005

No. 60

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for 5 minutes.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY OVERSIGHT

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of our national intelligence capability and what we in Congress must do to improve it.

Just a few weeks ago, the Commission on Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, the Robb-Silverman Commission, issued its report. One of the many charges leveled by the commission against the intelligence community, perhaps the most damning, is the intelligence community collects far too little information on many of the issues we care about most.

As the commission also points out, without information, analysis turns to guesswork. The state of the affairs in our intelligence community is alarming, dangerous and frankly unacceptable.

Within the span of 2 years, the United States has had two very obvious and public examples of intelligence failures. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, and the dead wrong con-

clusions reached about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs.

The 9/11 Commission took the first step in identifying what ails the intelligence community, by pointing out that it's a community in name only. It needs centralized direction and coordination. The intelligence reform bill Congress enacted last year establishes a director of national intelligence and tries to address this problem.

I also believe that Congress did not challenge the intelligence community aggressively enough before we invaded Iraq, either in the issue of weapons of mass destruction, or the likely aftermath of the invasion. We, in Congress must help the intelligence community move beyond the cold war mentality and focus more effectively on the challenges we face from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and from al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups within global reach.

But, beyond fixing the intelligence community, Congress needs to get its own house in order. We must do a better job of oversight of the intelligence community. Restoring effective and constructive Congressional oversight should be a top bipartisan priority in the 109th Congress. I believe there will be value in putting together a bicameral, bipartisan select committee like the Joint Economic Committee or the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the past, to take a hard look at how Congress should reform itself to better perform oversight of our intelligence.

In my view, the House and the Senate need similar structures to handle intelligence matters, so that the budget requests, legislative referrals and conferences between the two bodies on authorizations and appropriations are handled logically and simply and without disconnection or disfunction.

How would such a select committee work? Membership could be appointed by the leadership on both sides from

committees that deal with intelligence matters now. The committee could garner input from various groups including the intelligence community, other governmental organizations such as CRO, CBO and GAO, and from outside groups such as think tanks, former Members of Congress, and experts in the field.

Moreover, both the 9/11 Commission and the Robb-Silverman Commission made suggestions about how Congress should reform itself to do a better job with intelligence issues. These recommendations should be explored in depth. There are a number of fundamental questions that should be rethought: Which committee should have jurisdiction and oversight responsibilities for intelligence matters? Should there be a separate intelligence appropriations subcommittee? Should intelligence responsibility in Congress continue to be divided along programmatic lines, the JMIP, the TIARA, and the NIP? Should the current Select Committee on Intelligence be made permanent?

Mr. Speaker, these are not partisan questions, and they should not be addressed in a partisan fashion. I believe that for the sake of our own national security we must avoid a partisan blame game. We should focus on how to fix the intelligence community that is still reeling from its public failures and struggling to digest organizational reforms that we have already enacted.

At the same time, Congress must restore its own effective and constructive oversight over intelligence matters. I think a bicameral, bipartisan select committee could rise above the partisan and turf tensions that exist, and I urge Leader PELOSI and Speaker HASTERT to strongly consider this option as a way to improve the system.

In the final analysis, the intelligence community, the administration and the Congress must work all together to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3061

ensure that we can meet the intelligence challenges we face in the coming years. We must get this right.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF RAFAEL DIAZ-BALART

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I rise today to report to our colleagues of the passing of the father of our two very distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) and (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Rafael Diaz-Balart passed away last Friday after a brief illness of about 3 weeks. And he was one of the most incredible men I ever had the privilege of knowing.

I will say that, as we all know, the Diaz-Balart family has long been great champions of the cause of freedom and democracy in Cuba. And the greatest champion was the father, Rafael Diaz-Balart.

He had a very, very distinguished and varied career. He served as the majority leader in the Cuban House of Representatives, during the time of the Cuban Republic. Later, from exile, he founded the White Rose Party to fight the communist dictatorship.

He served 14 years as a Costa Rican diplomat, and was a legal advisor to the Spanish Government. He always continued to do everything that he possibly could to encourage the cause of democracy and freedom in his homeland.

He is an individual who was extraordinarily dedicated to his family. He had four wonderful sons. And I had the chance to talk to our two colleagues just last Friday shortly after he passed away. And I was struck with some of the things that were said.

As I said, it was a brief illness. And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) told me that his father said to the doctors, whom he had just met, he said, "It was worth getting sick just to have the chance to meet you wonderful guys."

And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) said to me that our father taught us how to live, and now he has taught us how to die. And I will say that for me personally it will be a great loss, because I had the opportunity to spend many wonderful times with Rafael Diaz-Balart, and I know that we all, as we think of his passing and the wonderful life that he led, will redouble our efforts to ensure that his dream of freedom and democracy finally come about for the Cuban people.

RECOGNIZING THE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Janu-

ary 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 2005, we will mark the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II. So I rise today to honor the men and women that did their duty in this war to comfort the families that lost loved ones.

World War II was truly a world war conflict, spread across the globe, and it is estimated that some 50 million people died as a result. The impact of the war was felt everywhere. Men and woman from every walk of life were encouraged to do their bit for the war effort, and they responded magnificently.

It is hard to imagine the relief and joy that those who had lived through the war experienced when at last the war finally ended. Veterans remember ripping the blackout curtains from their windows, turning on their lights, and sharing with their family, friends and neighbors or complete strangers their joy at hearing the news that the war was over.

However, we should remember that for many, the end of the war came over a period of months. For those who were serving in the Far East and their loved ones, the war continued long after the victory celebrations that are etched in our popular memory. World War II extracted a terrible toll, most brutally in terms of the dreadful human cost in dead, injured and of course disabled.

Year after year of sacrifice and uncertainty, of making do and going without, left its mark on each and every Nation. But it also helped forge an attitude of never again.

The images we see of people celebrating the end of the war are people shaking off their recent past and looking forward to a better peaceful future. As we look back on these images, we might stop to reflect upon not only the debt that we owe them, but to consider too the responsibility for the future that we have inherited.

As we look towards the future we look towards democracy. President Bush's trip to Europe, in particular the Soviet Union, exemplified his strong push towards his foreign policy agenda of spreading democracy. As we look towards the future today, President Bush also looked towards the past in remembrance of World War II.

He connected the struggles against Nazi and Communist tyranny in the part of the world to his own campaign to bring democracy to the Middle East. In an effort to encourage President Putin to acknowledge past national mistakes he said, "In regard to our occupation of the Middle East, we will not repeat the mistakes of other generations, appeasing or excusing tyranny, and sacrificing freedom in the vain pursuit of stability. We have learned our lesson. No one's life is expendable. In the long run our security and our true stability depends upon the freedom of others."

It is a remarkable statement that the President issued. It is this freedom, the

freedom and benefits of a democratic Nation that President Bush is trying to encourage people to reflect on. His scheduled stop in Latvia was a way of easing his participation into Monday's anniversary celebration in Moscow's Red Square.

But, of course, a trip like this reopened old wounds between Moscow and the Baltic States, which of course were absorbed into the Soviet Union in 1940 after the secret Molotov-Ribbentrop deal between Hitler and Joseph Stalin in 1939.

The agreement provided for Soviet occupation of Estonia, Latvia, part of Finland and later Lithuania in return for Nazi Germany's control over most of Poland. As President Bush looked back on the history of the Soviet Union, he tried to compare the United States' past mistakes to that of the Soviet Union.

President Bush noted that lengthy and difficult journey for us here in the United States for democracy, with our own civil war that we struggled through. As we look to the future, it is essential to remember the past and the mistakes we made as a Nation, and other Nations should do the same.

World War II embodies what certain mistakes can result in. Sixty years ago, millions of Europeans were suffering from homelessness or having been released from captivity or expelled as part of an act of vengeance.

So thousands of Americans and American families were left with a gaping hole, as they had lost loved ones in the battles during World War II. It is today that we make a stand and seek to liberalize other nations and encourage freedom and democracy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to praise President Bush for his statements that were made in Europe this week and again honor the lives of millions of soldiers that fought for the end of the war, World War II.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMAN of New York). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father of our freedom and our salvation, hear the prayers of Your people across this Nation. With them we pray as one for the Members of Congress who gather today to attend the

work of the people You lay upon their shoulders.

Fill them with wisdom and prudence that all their efforts on behalf of the needy and the forsaken may bring them satisfaction in their labors. And enkindle renewed hope for those who are in most need of Your mercy.

Make of them true leaders who live beyond self-interest and serve their brothers and sisters in this land of promise. To You, our God and Father, we commend this Nation, and we ultimately place all our trust in You, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 148. An Act to establish a United States Boxing Commission to administer the Act, and for other purposes.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SCORING VICTORIES ON EVERY FRONT

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, ever since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, punctured both our national security and our national economy, the House has responded on both fronts. We have worked tirelessly to both secure our homeland and defeat our terrorist enemies around the world, and we have worked with equal determination to secure our economy, helping it to grow and create jobs over the last 3½ years.

These two missions, economic prosperity and military victory, are so intertwined that it could be said that winning the war on terror is America's top economic priority, while growing our economy is a wartime necessity. Both prongs of our agenda are succeeding, Mr. Speaker.

Last week, the Department of Labor reported that 274,000 jobs were created in April, far more than economists predicted, while unemployment came in at just 5.2 percent. Meanwhile, the Congressional Budget Office reported that the deficit projection for the first 7 months of the fiscal year is \$50 billion lower than previously estimated. The deficit is going down. New home sales grew 12.2 percent over last year, and the overall economy grew at 3.1 percent for the first quarter of 2005. The economy is strong, it continues to grow, and that strength and growth make it possible for us to meet the needs of our military and conquer the challenges of the war on terror.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, we built on those successes by passing President Bush's emergency supplemental war budget with strong bipartisan support. And at the same time, offensive operations in the Iraqi and Afghani theaters have netted our troops significant victories over the last week. Dozens of terrorists and insurgents have been captured, and our intelligence gatherers continue to close the noose around our enemies.

Our continued success around the world enhances our security here at home, where this week we will add to that momentum by taking up a bill to reform the way that the Federal Government funds our first responders.

Under the new bill, firefighters, police, and emergency medical personnel will get the money they need via a streamlined funding system. That will help bolster our homeland security and national preparedness, which will further protect our economy, which will, in turn, continue to support our war effort.

All of these priorities are of a kind, Mr. Speaker: homeland security, national security, and economic strength; and this week, the House will score victories on every front.

U.S. NEEDS TO GET OUT OF IRAQ

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the administration is closing defense bases here at home and building new bases in Iraq. There is no money to maintain some defense installations here, but there is \$270 billion and counting for establishing a permanent presence in Iraq. The Armed Forces ranks are depleted. Enlistment is falling off. So the administration is hard at work privatizing the war, having hired about 20,000 so-called contractors, mercenaries, to do work that used to be done by the military.

A member of the new private army in Iraq may make as much as 10 times more than what an enlisted soldier makes, and private companies making billions from the Iraq war will no doubt be quick to make political contributions to make sure the war keeps

going. Our Reservist and National Guard units are fortifying a mission to which they should have never been called.

Iraq has turned into a tragedy. What is even more tragic is the thinking that says, Well, we are there; now we need to stay and finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get out. The sooner the better. And we need to hold accountable those whose lies sent our soldiers there at the cost of many American lives and the lives of innocent Iraqis.

RECOGNIZING THE WOMEN OF TOMORROW MENTOR AND SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an outstanding group from my congressional district, south Florida, the Women of Tomorrow Mentor and Scholarship Program: its founder, Jennifer Valoppi; its sponsor, NBC Channel 6; and, of course, their board of directors, Don Browne, Katherine Fernandez-Rundle, Donna Feldman, Judge Judy Kreeger, Marita Srebnick, and Sherry Williams, for their steadfast commitment to the women of our south Florida community.

Women of Tomorrow is a mentor and scholarship program designed to guide, to inspire, and to help at-risk young women achieve their true potential through education, job training, resume-building, and skill development.

We as a society have a profound obligation to enrich the lives of all of our citizens, and Women of Tomorrow fulfills that obligation by encouraging young women to achieve their dreams and embrace their true dignity.

I am proud of all of those who are associated with Women of Tomorrow for their continuing efforts to improving the lives of south Florida's youth.

ADDRESSING GANG VIOLENCE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the increasing problem of gang violence.

Since 2001, we have seen drastic budget cuts in youth violence prevention. At-risk kids need support and a place to go after school. They need the fundamental tools to make good choices.

Instead of funding these programs, the Congress has chosen to lock them up and throw away the key.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of message is this, and the bill that we are going to take up this week, giving to our at-risk youth? We must provide at-risk youth with a path to succeed, not a path to prison.

Our police forces are doing a very outstanding job, most especially in Dallas, Texas. However, prosecuting criminals is not enough. We also need to work on preventing future violence.

I am a strong supporter of law enforcement, but I do believe in prevention. It is less costly.

HONORING THE CITY OF STATESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor the city of Statesville for being selected Top Micropolitan of the Year by Site Selection Magazine.

Statesville is a dynamic town located in the foothills of North Carolina at the intersections of Interstate 77 and 40. This charming city is characterized by beautiful buildings, historic homes, clean air, a pleasant weather climate, terrific quality of life, and incredibly friendly people. It has been named by Site Selection Magazine as the number one small town in America for attracting new industry.

Agriculture thrives in Statesville, as does business, technology, and manufacturing. The Statesville Airport is the home base of many NASCAR teams that are based in Iredell County. Because of the wide variety of industries in Statesville, the town is known for its outstanding economic development and widely skilled local workforce.

By being selected Top Micropolitan, Statesville has demonstrated that there is no better place to live or work than northwest North Carolina. I am proud to represent Statesville and all of the other great cities located in the Fifth Congressional District.

FILIBUSTER SHOULD NOT STAND IN THE WAY OF NOMINEES

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, it is kind of hard to see justice served in this Nation when our Federal bench has vacancies on it. That is why the President has put forward a number of highly qualified, highly skilled people to serve on the Federal bench.

However, Senate Democrats do not like these judges. They have conspired to block judges using the filibuster. That means a nominee requires the approval not of 51 Senators, which the Constitution requires, a majority; but 60 Senators, a supermajority.

So Republicans would like to restore the tradition of the Senate approving the President's judicial nominations by requiring an up-or-down vote. This is called the Constitutional Option, because it empowers Senators to vote on judicial nominees, up or down. The rule change will apply only to judicial nominees.

It actually has been used before by Democrats. In 1995, 19 currently serving Democratic Senators voted to end all filibusters, and Senator ROBERT BYRD has tried to amend use of the filibuster several times.

As long as there is a Senate, there will be a filibuster and other delaying tactics available to thwart the majority and legislation. But as long as the Constitution directs the Senate to vote on judicial nominees, the filibuster will not stand in the way.

SUPPORTING JANICE ROGERS BROWN ON HER NOMINATION TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the nomination to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals of Janice Rogers Brown.

In the discussion over the filibuster, much has been lost with respect to the individuals who have been nominated, that is, who they are as real people.

Janice Rogers Brown is an outstanding member of the California Supreme Court. As attorney general of the State of California, I had the opportunity to review her record and on two occasions to vote to put her on the appellate court and then on the California Supreme Court.

She has worked in various different areas in the legal field. One of the outstanding periods of her work was as legal affairs secretary to Governor Pete Wilson, who on many occasions commented on the outstanding job she did for him, the tremendous legal mind she had, and the ability for her to listen to all sides and then come to a considered opinion.

Mr. Speaker, in the effort to resolve the problem in the other body, I hope that Janice Rogers Brown will not be left behind. She is an outstanding candidate, someone who would do well to serve on the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals, and someone who has had an outstanding record as a member of the California Supreme Court.

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH BIGGER AND BETTER IN TEXAS

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, being from Texas, I am frequently asked, are things truly bigger in Texas? And the answer, of course, is yes. As you work your way down that list of cattle farms and oil wells, put a big checkmark next to biomedical research.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of Texas, the 15 members of the University of Texas system in the year 2004 contrib-

uted almost \$13 billion to the economy of the State. They created over 111,000 jobs between them.

Now, one of six medical research institutions in Texas is the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School. Back in World War II when Baylor College of Medicine left for Houston, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School was started in an abandoned Army barracks; and from those humble beginnings, they have become a powerhouse in medical education, patient care, and research.

Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School boasts four Nobel Laureates. They have a new medical research tower which is being completed, and advances in medical imaging are going to be housed in that tower, as well as a new alliance for cellular signaling, to investigate how cells talk to each other will be housed in that building. With the acquisition of Zale Lipshy Hospital and St. Paul Hospital and the historic association with Parkland Memorial Hospital, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School has a total package.

So biomedical research, not only bigger, but better in Texas.

□ 1415

PRISONER REENTRY

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, I had the delightful experience of attending the very first meeting of the commission just established by the Governor of Illinois to look seriously at the whole question of prisoner re-entry, what to do with the 35,000, 36,000 people returning home from prison in our State. I want to commend the Governor of Illinois for his farsighted vision in looking at one of the pernicious problems facing urban America. We look forward to some productive action coming from that commission. Mr. Governor, I thank you.

ROTARY INTERNATIONAL DAY

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 142, celebrating and honoring Rotary International with a day of recognition.

As a Rotary member and past president of my hometown club, I can attest to the remarkable accomplishments of Rotary International, which was founded over 100 years ago, the world's first service club, and is now one of the largest nonprofit service organizations in the world. "Service above Self," the club's motto, has inspired members to provide humanitarian assistance and promote international good will. Rotary International funds club projects and sponsors volunteers around the

community and worldwide. In 1985, Rotary International launched Polio Plus and spearheaded efforts to immunize the children of the world against polio. Since then, polio cases have dropped 99 percent, and the world now stands on the threshold of eradicating this dreaded disease.

Mr. Speaker, Rotarians live by the 4-way test: Is it the truth? Is it fair to all concerned? Will it build good will and better friendships? And will it be beneficial to all concerned?

Would not we all be better off if we adopted this creed? Congratulations Rotary International.

THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do applaud the comments being a Rotarian. Rotary International has done a great deal.

But I rise today because, yesterday, we heard and read news reports of the United Nations efforts to keep secret the very information with which it should have been most forthcoming. At a time when the United Nations' reputation for trust, justice, fairness and following its own rules is at an all time low, it should be doing everything it can to bring information to light, whether it is good or bad.

However, this United Nations and apparently its leader has far more guilty culpability than many of us ever suspected. The United Nations' leadership seems united in one thing: Do not let people discover the truth. The U.N. leadership, if it spent half the time lining the fabric of freedom as it is alleged to have done in lining the pockets of his family and friends, we would not have these problems.

If the U.N. is going to cover up the wrongs it has done from those who pay for the U.N., then it is high time we cover our U.S. bank account from them. We are literally paying them to hire guns, to hide information from us. Organized crime is said to have cleaners that come in and clean up after illegal activity. Sounds like the Secretary General himself has full-time cleaners on his staff.

It is time to hold the U.N. accountable.

TAX CUTS

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of last week, we got reports of an unanticipated surge in revenues to the Federal Treasury. Many people on this House Floor from the other side of the aisle for a long period of time decried the prospects of the Bush tax cuts, saying that they would take our economy right into the tank and ensure that we would never be able to balance the Federal budget.

Well, the fact of the matter is, Democrats and Republicans alike now talk about the need to focus on fiscal responsibility and turning the corner on the massive Federal deficit that we have. The single most important thing that we can do is to make sure that the economy is growing.

And we, by virtue of putting into place the tax cuts in the last 3 years, have actually dramatically increased through those tax cuts by 29 percent the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury, beyond what had been anticipated. Our policy of making sure that we grow the economy is critically important.

Another component of that will be passage of the Central American Free Trade Agreement, which we will be voting on in the not-too-distant future. It is critically important that we keep this pro-growth agenda moving so that we can, in fact, have the revenues we need to balance the budget.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB NEY, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
H-232 The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 101-696 Section 801 (40 USC para. 188a(b)) the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library is provided a position on the Capitol Preservation Commission.

I am appointing Mr. JOHN MICA of Florida to be my designee as provided for in Public Law 101-696 section 801 (40 USC para. 188a(c)).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
BOB NEY,
Chairman, Joint Committee on the Library.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

CHARLES "PETE" CONRAD ASTRONOMY AWARDS ACT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1023) to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish an awards program in honor of Charles "Pete" Conrad, astronaut and space

scientist, for recognizing the discoveries made by amateur astronomers of asteroids with near-Earth orbit trajectories.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1023

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Charles 'Pete' Conrad Astronomy Awards Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) the term "amateur astronomer" means an individual whose employer does not provide any funding, payment, or compensation to the individual for the observation of asteroids and other celestial bodies, and does not include any individual employed as a professional astronomer;

(3) the term "Minor Planet Center" means the Minor Planet Center of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory;

(4) the term "near-Earth asteroid" means an asteroid with a perihelion distance of less than 1.3 Astronomical Units from the Sun; and

(5) the term "Program" means the Charles "Pete" Conrad Astronomy Awards Program established under section 3.

SEC. 3. PETE CONRAD ASTRONOMY AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish the Charles "Pete" Conrad Astronomy Awards Program.

(b) AWARDS.—The Administrator shall make awards under the Program based on the recommendations of the Minor Planet Center.

(c) AWARD CATEGORIES.—The Administrator shall make one annual award, unless there are no eligible discoveries or contributions, for each of the following categories:

(1) The amateur astronomer or group of amateur astronomers who in the preceding calendar year discovered the intrinsically brightest near-Earth asteroid among the near-Earth asteroids that were discovered during that year by amateur astronomers or groups of amateur astronomers.

(2) The amateur astronomer or group of amateur astronomers who made the greatest contribution to the Minor Planet Center's mission of cataloguing near-Earth asteroids during the preceding year.

(d) AWARD AMOUNT.—An award under the Program shall be in the amount of \$3,000.

(e) GUIDELINES.—(1) No individual who is not a citizen or permanent resident of the United States at the time of his discovery or contribution may receive an award under this Act.

(2) The decisions of the Administrator in making awards under this Act are final.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—From sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1023, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during my recent tenure as chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science, one of my top priorities was to mitigate the threat posed by near-Earth objects. The hearings of our subcommittee have revealed that monitoring and tracking near-Earth objects, that is, NEOs, such as comets and asteroids, not only advance astronomy but are critical to identifying the near-Earth objects that may threaten the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, just as recently as last December, an asteroid 350 yards in diameter, named 2004 MN4, was discovered to have an orbit that will take it less than one-tenth of the distance from here to the moon. That is right in the region of where our artificial satellites are, and that will happen in the year 2029.

According to NASA JPL and the Minor Planet Center at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, several additional close encounters are possible in the next decade or two, and thus, we have one coming very close soon. And we have some that are predicted shortly thereafter. The hazard associated with such an asteroid hitting this planet is fairly well known. It could flatten an area the size of Texas or perhaps Colorado, I would say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), or Tennessee or any of the other States and cause significant tsunami damage to coast lines throughout the world.

We cannot assess the risk or likelihood of such an event unless we know what is out there. Accounts of asteroids passing close to the earth have raised public awareness of the possibility that one day one of these objects could hit the earth with potential catastrophic consequences. Given the vast number of asteroids and comets that inhabit the Earth's neighborhood, greater efforts for tracking and monitoring these objects is critical.

This is why I authored H.R. 1023, the Charles "Pete" Conrad Astronomy Awards Act. This bill is strongly supported by NASA, the Smithsonian Institute and our colleagues across the aisle. This is truly a bipartisan effort. I thank them all. H.R. 1023 authorizes the NASA administrator to give one award each year to the amateur astronomer or group of amateur astronomers who discover the intrinsically brightest near-Earth asteroid among the near-Earth asteroids discovered in that preceding year by amateur astronomers. Another award will go to the amateur astronomer or group of amateur astronomers who made the

greatest contribution during the preceding year to the Minor Planet Center's catalog of known asteroids. The recipients of the awards will receive \$3,000, and it is limited to U.S. citizens or permanent residents.

This bill is a tribute to Pete Conrad for his tremendous contributions to our country, to the world and to the aerospace community over four decades. Pete Conrad was a pilot, an explorer, an entrepreneur of the highest caliber. He was a friend of mine who lived in Huntington Beach. He commanded *Apollo XII*, and during that mission, he became the third man to walk on the moon. He saw space as a place to get to and to explore and to do business. Space exploration and commercialization is what he was all about. It was his job to explore the moon and to get to know the heavens better. He then worked to develop a new spacecraft and a new space transportation system. That is when I got to know him the best, a few years ago.

An interesting aside, the analysis of an orbiting object identified by an amateur astronomer, and that is just recently, suggests that instead of a near-Earth object being an asteroid, what was identified were the remains of the Saturn V rocket, third stage, which most likely came from Pete Conrad's Apollo mission.

So I find no better way to honor Pete Conrad, who died just a few years ago tragically in a motorcycle accident, than to establish this annual astronomy award for future asteroid discoveries in his name. He always wanted people to be looking up. He always wanted people to be positive. He was a can-do American with a very positive spirit, American spirit. He, in fact, exemplified the American spirit more than any person I have ever met. He was often remembered of course not only for his walk on the moon but his historic description of the moon landing and also, I might add, his historic description of the take off of his rocket, which was, "whoopee". Well, that was the Pete Conrad we knew. And he was excited about life and excited about technology as expanding the horizons of our people and the safety of this planet.

Films like *Armageddon* and *Deep Impact* of a few years ago excited large audiences, but it is vital for all of us to realize that this is not just the movies we are talking about. This is not science fiction. We all know that Earth's moons and other planetary objects are covered with impact craters. Most people have heard of the dinosaur extinction theory or perhaps seen a picture of this meteor and crater in Arizona suggesting that the craters on the moon and these other places could well have had serious impact on the Earth and may well have that impact in the future. However remote the possibility of a near-Earth object striking the Earth and causing a worldwide calamity, no matter how obscure or how remote that is, there is a calculable

threat, and we should know what that threat is.

And while the asteroid that is believed to have killed the dinosaurs is estimated to have occurred many many years ago and will only occur once every 100 years, smaller, yet still hazardous asteroids could impact Earth much more frequently. For example, the destructive force of an asteroid that struck Siberia in 1908 was roughly equal to a 10-mega-ton blast of TNT.

Ironically, if we look at asteroids from the perspective of our national goals in space, they offer us not just a threat that we are looking at but also a unique opportunity. This is one reason that we should be tracking these asteroids, because in terms of pure science, asteroids are good geological time capsules from the era when our solar system was formed. Even better, they are orbiting mines for metal, for materials and other resources that can be possibly used to build large structures in space without having to carry up the materials to build those structures from the Earth. So far, NASA has surveyed 650 asteroids. But this is a fraction of the projected total population of asteroids and near-Earth objects. What needs to be done now is to fully understand near-Earth objects and the potential threat and, yes, the potential use that they could pose for the world.

In closing, asteroids deserve a lot more attention from the scientific community and from the American people. The first step to tracking them and tracking sizable near-Earth objects is H.R. 1023, and it is a modest step. But what we are doing is mobilizing the amateurs and the young people and the private sector, if you will, and students throughout the country to look up and enlisting them in this effort. Nothing could be better for encouraging young people to get involved in the space program, to have them involved in trying to win this award and looking out into the heavens and identifying what they see. I would suggest that this small award will have an enormous impact on the number of young people that are involved in astrology and thus involved in America's space program.

□ 1430

I would urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1023 which will encourage young people, in particular, as I say, to look up; and let us all as we pass this bill remember Pete Conrad and the great space entrepreneurs and the great space explorers that are leading the way for the next generations of Americans which will go a long way towards filling and fulfilling the legacy left by Pete Conrad.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today with my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), to speak in favor

of H.R. 1023, the Charles "Pete" Conrad Astronomy Awards Act.

This bill is a thoughtful measure that establishes an awards program to encourage efforts by amateur astronomers to detect and catalog near-Earth asteroids.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) pointed out, near-Earth asteroids are of interest for a number of reasons. Scientifically, they provide a window into the earliest days of the solar system. Some of the near-Earth asteroids are also thought to contain valuable minerals and ores that could be mined by future generations. Finally, there is a growing consensus that near-Earth asteroids have impacted the Earth at various times in its history, resulting in widespread extinction of animals and plants. For that reason alone, I think it makes very good sense to learn more about these objects.

NASA, of course, has been conducting research on asteroids and comets for a long time. I agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) that the amateur astronomy community offers an important additional source of observations. Moreover, as one who is very interested in promoting science education and outreach, I believe that H.R. 1023 offers a constructive, low-cost way of stimulating public interest in astronomy.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) on his initiative. I think it is a sensible measure. I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1023.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me note that there are a lot of people who poo-pooed this idea of near-Earth objects and said, you are just trying to scare people, or whatever. And after the movie "Deep Impact" and such, that maybe this is some sort of scare tactic or you are trying to get attention by talking about something, a threat that is so minuscule that why should we worry about it.

Well, several years ago, I chaired a hearing into the near-Earth object issue, and one of the witnesses who was poo-pooing this idea and downplaying the risk suggested that the chances of me dying from this near-Earth object striking the Earth were the same chances that I would have of going to Las Vegas and having a royal straight flush. And it was a shocking thing for him to tell me that because, Mr. Speaker, I did go to Las Vegas once and had a royal straight flush and it was amazing.

I said that happened to me, and the fact is that, yes, it is unlikely that people will get royal straight flushes and it is unlikely that we will have near-Earth objects destroying all of hu-

mankind, but we should nevertheless be prepared if there is a possible way to avert a catastrophe by having knowledge of a near-Earth object heading in our direction.

Also, as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) described, if near-Earth objects are coming close to the Earth, they pose a great opportunity for us as well as create a threat if they were headed towards us. We should be prepared, number one, to try to alter the course if it is a dangerous course towards the Earth of a near-Earth object; but we should also be prepared to take advantage of the potential if there is a near-Earth object coming near the Earth to utilize it for a number of things like mining or studying the nature of the universe.

With this said, I cannot think of a better tribute to Pete Conrad who fought in World War II and who protected our country but also moved on and made great contributions to his country through the space program than to have this, as a civilian, I might add, in a civilian entrepreneur mentality that Pete exemplified. All of these are encompassed in this bill: safety and prosperity and accomplishment.

With that said, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for this Pete Conrad bill, H.R. 1023.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will be brief. I just want to second what the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has outlined here, that the Earth has been hit over geologic times by a number of asteroids and bodies outside the orbit of the Earth. And it would be a smart thing for us to do to better understand the potential impacts and effects.

Secondly, I just wanted to lend my voice to those of us here who admired Pete Conrad and think this is a very suitable way to keep his legacy alive and to inspire, particularly young people, as we have discussed here today, to go into this exciting world of astronomy and space exploration. Pete Conrad is a shining example of that.

It is with pride and excitement that I want to acknowledge the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER). I urge all the Members to vote for this important piece of legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of H.R. 1023, a bill that authorizes the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish an awards program in honor of Charles "Pete" Conrad, who was an astronaut and space scientist, for recognizing the discoveries made by amateur astronomers of asteroids with near-Earth orbit trajectories. Let me thank my colleague on the Science committee, Mr. ROHRBACHER for introducing this resolution and seeing it through for final pas-

sage. This resolution honors the scientific contributions of the past, while also recognizing the scientific discoveries of the future.

Known for his sense of humor and infectious grin, Charles P. Conrad, as commander of the Apollo 12 mission, was the third person to walk on the moon. Not a tall man, Conrad stepped down onto the lunar surface in November of 1969 and cheerfully commented, "Whoopie! Man, that may have been a small one for Neil, but that's a long one for me." Born June 2nd, 1930 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, he graduated from Princeton University in 1953 and went on to become a Navy test pilot. Selected as a NASA astronaut in 1962, Conrad in 1965 went on his first space flight—the endurance record setting Gemini 5 mission. His final space flight was to Skylab in 1973.

Unfortunately, Conrad died from injuries in a motorcycle accident on Thursday, July 8, 1999. Today, we have a chance to ensure that his legacy lives on. In addition, we have the opportunity to recognize the discoveries made by amateur astronomers of asteroids with near-Earth orbit trajectories. This is indeed a worthwhile resolution because it allows us to celebrate a great man of science and recognize the amateur astronomer of today. So, I urge my colleagues to support this meaningful legislation.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague, Congressman DANA ROHRBACHER, introducing this important legislation honoring our late California constituent, Charles "Pete" Conrad, for his remarkable achievements in spaceflight as well as his contribution to the U.S. aerospace industry. Pete was a great American and this is a tribute to his contributions to space and to science.

Pete Conrad was an individual who was always pushing the envelope with an exuberance that matched his animated personality and sense of humor. Pete's first flights were in the Gemini program, where he established both the record for endurance and for altitude in space. Then, as the commander of *Apollo XII*, he became the third man to walk on the Moon—to which he exclaimed in his typical enthusiastic manner, "Whoopie! Man, that may have been a small one for Neil, but it's a long one for me." His final National Aeronautics and Space Administration mission was a commander of Skylab II, the first United States space station.

Once he left the Astronaut Corps, Pete delved into what was then the nascent aerospace industry. He worked to sell the industry to the American people and to excite them on the possibilities of the return to and the colonization of the Moon, the development of single-stage-to-orbit vehicles, and in the exploration of the solar system. During this time, Pete stayed with his love of anything that would go fast—airplanes, helicopters, cars and motorcycles. He raced helicopters across the country; he raced airplanes in air shows; and he raced motorcycles in local races. Tragically, he died from injuries resulting from a motorcycle accident in 1999 and at the age of 69 in Ojai, CA.

This bill, which honors Pete Conrad and is a tribute to his wife Nancy, encourages young people to get involved in astronomy by offering prizes to amateurs for their contributions to

astronomy by either discovering the brightest near-Earth object or by the cataloging of near Earth objects. What better way to get our children interested in science and in paying tribute to this great American.

Mrs. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1023.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF THE HISTORIC MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY TO PROMOTE THE CIVIL SOCIETY IN CUBA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 193) expressing support to the organizers and participants of the historic meeting of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba on May 20, 2005, in Havana.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 193

Whereas Fidel Castro's terrorist regime has continued to repress all attempts by the Cuban people to bring democratic change to Cuba and denies universally recognized liberties, including freedom of speech, association, movement, and the press;

Whereas thousands of political prisoners are currently imprisoned by Fidel Castro's totalitarian regime;

Whereas in March 2003 Fidel Castro carried out a massive, island wide crackdown on members of Cuba's pro-democracy movement, under which pro-democracy activists were arrested, subjected to "summary trials", and sentenced to up to 28 years in prison for their pro-democracy activities;

Whereas the Department of State's 2004 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, in referring to Castro's Cuba, states: "Members of the security forces and prison officials continued to beat and abuse detainees and prisoners, including human rights activists. . . . Prison conditions remained harsh and life threatening, and the Government restricted medical care to some prisoners as a method of control. Prisoners died in jail due to lack of medical care.";

Whereas on May 20, 1902, the Republic of Cuba obtained its independence;

Whereas in the spirit of Jose Marti, many of the future leaders of a free Cuba have called for a meeting of the Assembly of the Civil Society in Cuba, an organization that consists of over 360 opposition and civil society organizations in Cuba;

Whereas on May 20, 2005, the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba seeks to convene an historic meeting in Havana on the 103rd anniversary of Cuban Independence;

Whereas the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba will focus on bringing democracy and liberty to the enslaved island of Cuba;

Whereas the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba is led by three coura-

geous pro-democracy opponents of the Castro regime—Martha Beatriz Roque Cabello, Felix Bonne Carcasses, and Rene Gomez Manzano;

Whereas organizers and participants are convening a meeting of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba at great risk to themselves and their families; and

Whereas President George W. Bush stated in his second inaugural address on January 20, 2005: "All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know: the United States will not ignore your oppression, or excuse your oppressors. When you stand for your liberty, we will stand with you. Democratic reformers facing repression, prison, or exile can know: America sees you for who you are—the future leaders of your free country." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) extends its support and solidarity to the organizers and participants of the historic meeting of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba on May 20, 2005, in Havana;

(2) urges the international community to support the Assembly's mission to bring democracy to Cuba;

(3) urges the Administration and international community to actively oppose any attempts by the Castro regime to repress or punish the organizers and participants of the Assembly; and

(4) shares the pro-democracy ideals of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba and believes that this Assembly and others will hasten the day of freedom and democracy for the people of Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 193.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 193, and I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) for writing this important measure and bringing it to the floor. I would like to also thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), as well as the House leadership, for helping us bring this resolution to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

Mr. Speaker, even the most violent and repressive dictatorships cannot extinguish freedom when it lives in people's hearts, and Cuba is no exception. The dictator Fidel Castro has always used fear to keep himself and his cronies in power.

Two years ago, the tyrant again attempted to silence the cries for liberty and democracy that emanate from every corner of the Cuban gulag. He arrested over 75 dissidents and sentenced them to prison terms each up to 25 years. What were their crimes? Simply daring to exercise their fundamental freedoms, for daring to be free men and women.

These 75 are just some of the most recent ones. There are many more Cuban prisoners of conscience who languish in squalid jail cells. However, Mr. Speaker, all of Cuba is an island prison; and today we rise to commend and support the activities of Cuba's peaceful internal opposition.

On May 20, Cuba's democratic opposition will convene in an Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba. This historic meeting will discuss ways to bring democracy and liberty to the nation of Cuba, which has suffered under a brutal dictatorship for more than four decades. May 20, 2005, will also mark the 103rd anniversary of the Cuban Republic, of Cuba's birth as a free nation.

Yet the Cuban opposition is determined to correct this injustice and reclaim their rights as free people in a free, democratic, and sovereign nation. The May 20th Assembly to Promote Civil Society in Cuba is an important step toward the fulfillment of this goal.

Martha Beatriz Roque Cabello, Felix Bonne Carcasses, and Rene Gomez Manzano and many others are the organizers of this landmark meeting. Despite the risks and the constant threats that the dictator holds over their heads, they are living examples to their countrymen of courage and determination, of how to follow in the footsteps of Pope John Paul, II, and be not afraid.

Just recently, a group of young Cubans held an essay contest focusing on a democratic transition in Cuba. One of the finalists, Edgar Lopez Moreno, struck a chord that doubtless resonates with the vast majority of his countrymen. He wrote: "After 46 years of political ostracism and imposition by the Communist Party and its maximum leader, today the process of transition to democracy on the island is closer than ever."

The winds of freedom are behind the Cuban opposition. The just nature of their cause has given them wings. Soon democracy will take flight in Cuba. Soon the Cuban people will free themselves from the grip of this dictator, but they need our help. They need our support, and it begins here and now.

I urge my colleagues to stand with these brave Cubans by joining me in voting for the resolution of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I too

want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for facilitating consideration of this resolution. I also want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), the sponsor of this resolution, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, for his never-ending battle for human rights in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago on the House floor, we chastised the Cuban regime for its inexorable continued detention of political dissidents, many of whom are jailed because of their conviction to seek freedom and democracy in Cuba. Unfortunately, there is no indication from Castro that he ever plans to implement political and economic reforms that would give hope to the approximately 11 million citizens on the island who have suffered for far too long.

Many internationally recognized human rights groups like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have denounced Castro's brutal dictatorship over the years and called for reforms, the release of political prisoners, and urged the totalitarian government to respect basic human freedoms.

This year the Human Rights Commission called attention to the injustices which continue to be inflicted upon those innocent individuals who toil in Castro's prisons. Undeterred, thousands of brave Cubans have sought to bring about political change through opposition and civil society organizations which are loosely coordinated by the Assembly of the Civil Society in Cuba.

The assembly is planning a historic meeting next week on the 103rd anniversary of Cuban independence. Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage the organizers of the meeting of the assembly to include in the meeting political dissidents who may disagree with them about whether to engage officials within Castro's government on the transition process, in particular, the supporters of the Varela Project, a grassroots, non-violent, citizens' movement in Cuba that seeks fundamental political change by petitioning the Cuban government for a referendum on reform according to that country's constitution.

These groups should feel as though they are welcome within the broader coalition that opposes Castro's policies. Regardless of which groups of political activists attend the assembly, I am concerned that Castro's henchmen will once again try to suppress dissent through the use of force. As a result, I strongly concur with the sentiment expressed in the resolution urging the administration and the international community to stand ready to respond to such an atrocity.

This resolution demonstrates our unequivocal commitment to stand shoulder

to shoulder with the Cuban people if such an unjustified response were to occur. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 193.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), the author of the resolution.

□ 1445

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida, also my dear friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) from West Palm Beach.

Today, Congress is supporting these brave individuals in Cuba who, despite all of the dangers, are standing up for freedom, are standing up for democracy, from within Cuba, from within that totalitarian island.

The three main organizers, Martha Beatriz Roque Cabello, Felix Bonne Carcasses, and Rene Gomez Manzano, all three of which have suffered prison time by the Cuban dictatorship, are standing up because they know that the answer to the problems that the Cuban people face is simply just one: It is freedom, total, absolute freedom.

That entails the release of all political prisoners. It entails political parties. It entails freedom of press. It entails free elections, and they are standing up from within Cuba and with many other hundreds of their countrymen who are standing up, having this event on May 20 to express their sentiment and also to prepare and work for a free Cuba.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, extends and supports solidarity to the organizers and to the participants of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society, which again is on May 20 in Havana.

It urges the international community to support the assembly of these heroes that are standing up for freedom despite the risk.

It urges the administration and also the international community, Mr. Speaker, to oppose any attempts by Castro's terrorist regime to punish or repress the organizers and the participants.

It obviously shares, also, Mr. Speaker, the pro-democracy ideals of the assembly.

The commissions, Mr. Speaker, that these individuals are working with are hard to believe. The Department of State's 2004 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, referring to the Castro regime, states the following:

"Members of the security forces and prison officials continued to beat and abuse detainees and prisoners, including human rights activists. Prison conditions remained harsh and life threatening, and the government restricted medical care to some prisoners as a method of control. Prisoners died in jail due to lack of medical care."

President Bush said, Mr. Speaker, in his second inaugural address, and I am quoting him now, "All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know: The United States will not ignore your oppression or excuse your oppressors. When you stand for your liberty, we will stand with you."

The Cuban people are standing tall, Mr. Speaker, for their freedom. Today, by voting for this resolution, the United States Congress stands with them, lets them know that they are not alone, that despite all the risks, despite the horrendous conditions that they are facing on a day-to-day basis, the United States Congress stands with them, admires them and supports what they are doing.

Cuba will be free because of the efforts of the heroic Cuban people, and it is wonderful, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Congress of the United States, once again, is supporting the Cuban people in their efforts, in their struggle to be free.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from south Florida (Mr. WEXLER) for the time.

This resolution is very important because it continues the very important, historic tradition begun here in this Congress, by this Congress in April of 1898 when, after a century of fighting by the people of Cuba for the independence of Cuba, the United States, because of the Congress of the United States, came out in support of Cuban independence. In April of 1898, this Congress passed what is very well-known in Cuban history, the joint resolution that recognized that Cuba is and of right ought to be free and independent. So this Congress began a tradition in April of 1898 that continues to this day, a tradition in support of the right of the Cuban people to be free.

For the last 46 years, the Cuban people unfortunately have been under the boot of a totalitarian dictatorship that, while it has perhaps been the most inept, certainly one of the most inept of the Communist dictatorships in having achieved the systematic, utter destruction of what was one of the most prosperous economies in this hemisphere; in that sense, it has been absolutely inept. In terms of totalitarian control, it has been quite effective, and it maintains an absolute, intense oppression over the Cuban people to this day.

My colleagues have mentioned the onslaught of 2 years ago that was condemned by a resolution offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) a few weeks ago, and it was condemned by this House, the absolute campaign, if you will, of the march of 2003 that arrested dozens and dozens and dozens, almost 100 pro-democracy leaders and threw them in prison, but the campaign continues.

The campaign of oppression and intimidation, beginning in January of this year, the totalitarian Communist regime in Cuba has begun a systematic campaign of ethnic cleansing. Hundreds of young people, mostly young men, 95 percent of whom are black, have been rounded up and thrown in prisons beginning in January of this year in what the dictator calls Operation Containment, containment of the young people.

Now, this assembly was organized, as has been mentioned by my distinguished colleagues, by Martha Beatriz Roque Cabello and Felix Bonne Carcasses and Rene Gomez Manzano, is an important, historic development. There are some people who now say that we must reject the subterfuge seeking to attack this assembly, that they have not invited all pro-democracy groups. All pro-democracy groups, the organizers of this assembly have invited all individuals and organizations within Cuba who support democracy. Some say then they have not been invited. In fact, they have been invited, but that is not the problem of the organizer. That is the problem of somebody else, very important.

This is an important, extremely valiant effort that over 360 civil society groups, pro-democracy groups within the island have called for, and they seek to meet on May 20. So what this Congress today is saying is: We support you. We know what you are doing. We know the courage that it entails to say, within a totalitarian state, that a meeting will be held in support of freedom and democracy and free elections and the legalization of political parties and freedom of religion and freedom of the press and freedom of expression. Within the totalitarian state, to say that there will be a meeting engaged in such discussion is really a heroic act, and so today, what we are saying is that we recognize that, and we support you.

Simply to end, Mr. Speaker, as I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) for having brought forth this resolution today in such an important and timely manner, I simply want to read the names of some of the thousands of political prisoners who cannot have their voices heard. Obviously, they all deserve to be heard, but I would like to read some of their names.

It is my privilege and honor to serve in this Congress with my brother Mario, where there are two brothers who are serving in prison in Cuba simply because they came out publicly in support of freedom and democracy. One brother, Jose Daniel Ferrer Garcia, was sentenced to 25 years in the gulag for his support of democracy. The other one, Luis Enrique Ferrer Garcia, was sentenced to 28 years in the gulag because he supports democracy.

Someone who I admire very much, I have followed his long and distinguished fight for freedom for many years, has been languishing since 1990,

mostly in solitary. His name is Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, also known as Antunez. He was sentenced to 18 years because, ever since he was in high school, he said he favors democracy and rejects totalitarianism, and so he has suffered the consequences since then.

Juan Carlos Herrera Acosta, 20 years in the gulag.

Diosdado Gonzalez Marrero, 20 years in the gulag.

Felix Navarro Rodriguez, 25 years.

Prospero Gainza Aguero, 25 years.

Hector Maseda Gutierrez, 20 years.

Claro Sanchez Altarriba, 15 years.

Victor Rolando Arroyo, 26 years.

And perhaps the best known, certainly someone who is a symbol of resistance, character, dignity, as all these men and women are, Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet, 25 years.

There are thousands, Mr. Speaker, of men and women like this, many, by the way, charged with what they call in the totalitarian system common crimes, like seeking to leave, seeking to flee to freedom. That is a common crime. So the regime does not even recognize them as political prisoners. There are thousands of political prisoners in Cuba such as these men whose names I have read. We owe them our solidarity.

Today, we are expressing our solidarity, and specifically through this resolution, our solidarity with the meeting convened for May 20, which will seek to develop ways to hasten what is inevitable, and that is an end to the totalitarian nightmare and the commencement of the dawn of freedom.

Mr. MACK. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this resolution—sponsored by my distinguished friend and neighbor, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida—which recognizes the upcoming Assembly To Promote Civil Society in Cuba.

I am proud to associate myself with causes that seek to increase freedom, security, and prosperity for people throughout the world. On May 20th, we will mark Cuban Independence Day. This is the day Cuba proclaimed to the world its sovereignty and independence. Sadly, freedom for the Cuban people was short-lived. The world stood by as Cuba lost its liberty and slipped into the abyss of authoritarian rule and the clutches of Fidel Castro's thuggish regime.

Madam Speaker, today Cuba is a lonely island nation separated by 90 miles from the greatest beacon of freedom the world has ever known—the United States. Many in Cuba thirst for the waters of liberty, only to see those yearnings suppressed by a brutal dictator.

America has always stood for freedom, and always will. Under the leadership of President George W. Bush, we have endeavored to spread liberty to the Middle East and throughout the world. It is past time to shine the light of freedom on the despotic regimes in our own backyard.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support the right of the Cuban people to live in a free and democratic society. I am confident that the Assembly To Promote Civil Society in Cuba will

help spark the flame of liberty on the island and the rest of the Americas. I urge my colleagues to stand for liberty and to champion the spirit of freedom for the people of Cuba.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I am proud to join a bipartisan group of original co-sponsors of this resolution which supports the development of democracy and civil society in Cuba. As you know, on May 20th, opposition leaders are organizing a historic Assembly on the 103rd Anniversary of Cuban independence.

In this momentous meeting of 365 independent organizations, Cuba will hear a dialogue of freedom and progress. This Assembly will continue a discussion—from within Cuba—of how to begin the process of reconstructing a democratic culture, promoting civil society, combating poverty, and establishing labor rights. They are Cuba's bravest and brightest—they are Cuba's future.

Who among us would not be supportive of the right to peaceful assembly and public discourse? That is what this resolution and Cuban civil society is calling for on May 20th.

As we learned in a Western Hemisphere Subcommittee hearing early this year, the organizers and the participants in this event are risking their personal freedom for the freedom of the Cuban people.

This resolution makes it clear that we oppose any attempt by the Castro regime to repress or punish the organizers and participants of the Assembly, as Castro has done with so many others who have spoken out against repression. News reports indicate that Cuban dissidents who are choosing to participate in the Assembly are already being harassed.

This past April 20th—not even a month ago—three of these dissidents took the time to speak to many of us about their situation. They told of the beatings, detentions, interrogations, harassment and political slander which they and other dissidents are being subjected to as the Cuban regime continues to try to repress and de-legitimize their struggle for freedom.

And let us not forget the crackdown on human rights two years ago, when Castro arrested 75 dissidents, subjected them to summary trials, and sentenced them to long jail terms. Many of the prisoners, along with other prisoners of conscience, spent over a year in solitary confinement. Some have been deprived of adequate medical treatment, and reports from Cuba detail beatings and harassment.

Clearly, the Castro regime has no respect for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states in Article 4 that, "No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

That is why I am proud of my resolution that passed with bipartisan support condemning Castro's brutal crackdown and demanding that the Cuban regime immediately release all political prisoners, legalize all political parties, labor unions, and the press, and hold free and fair elections.

On that day, we came together from both sides of the aisle, to stand together for a universal cause, human rights, and to celebrate the strength and perseverance of the Cuban people.

That is why I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution. This resolution

says again that we stand behind those who risk repression and harassment to bring freedom to their long-suffering people.

It says that the international community is watching Castro, and that we will not accept the abuses of human and civil rights that the Castro regime employs so indifferently.

And it says that we believe in the Assembly and the ability of a group of individuals with a strong faith in democracy to free their people from a tyrant's restrictive grasp.

To my brothers and sisters who suffer in Castro's jails, under his regime, to their families and friends both here in the United States and in Cuba, to the leaders and participants in the Assembly to Promote Civil Society in Cuba, and to the Cuban people, I say that Castro's days are numbered. Over a hundred years ago, the Cuban people won the battle against brutality and oppression and fought for their freedom. I have no doubt that we will win again. I look forward to that day, which is coming soon, when on May 20, our independence day, we will all celebrate a free and democratic Cuba.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 193, which expresses support for the courageous advocates of freedom in Cuba, who are gathering ten days from now in Havana for the first Assembly to Promote the Civil Society conference which will focus on bringing democracy, liberty, and the rule of law to this enslaved island.

Madam Speaker, in recent years, this House has overwhelmingly passed numerous resolutions condemning the egregious human rights violations of the Castro regime. These violations, which have been continually cited through comprehensive, compelling reports, include the pervasive use of torture and vicious beatings of political prisoners. We know that this year the UN Convention on Human Rights in Geneva also passed a resolution condemning the government of Cuba's deplorable human rights record.

Today, we celebrate those brave Cubans who have been undaunted by Castro's reign of terror and who continue to speak out fearlessly for freedom in Cuba. Mr. Speaker, I note that on March 3, three of the main organizers of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society testified via telephone at a joint hearing I chaired with the Africa, Global Human Rights, and International Operation Subcommittee and the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. The hearing was appropriately entitled "Year Two of Castro's Brutal Crackdown on Dissidents."

The three who spoke at this hearing were Martha Beatriz Roque, an internationally renowned Cuban economist; Felix Bonne, a Cuban engineering professor; and Rene Gomez Manzano, a Cuban attorney. All three have spent time in Cuba's prisons for their pro-democracy activities and co-authored a book, "The Homeland Belongs to Us." The courage they demonstrated through testifying was truly inspiring and they provided a tremendous witness of the desire of the Cuban people to be free.

Martha Beatriz Roque was arrested in the now infamous March 2003 crackdown of Cuba's bravest and brightest were rounded

up, paraded before kangaroo courts on trumped up charges and given harsh prison sentences with sickening speed. She was sentenced to 20 years in prison but released in July of 2004 because of poor health. In an interview after her release, Roque said: "I leave prison without having accepted any sort of conditions. I am a dissident and I will remain one."

Madam Speaker, we gather today in support of Roque, Bonne, Manzano, and these other brave leaders as they prepare for this historic event. I have been invited to participate in the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society and sent my visa application through the Department of State to Cuba through the US Interest Section.

Madam Speaker, I note that in March of 2003, I also requested to travel to Cuba along with my colleague, Congressman FRANK WOLF, but we were denied visas. This is a regime that has strongly advocated for trade and travel with the United States, and yet the government of Cuba would not give visas to two Members of Congress, each of whom have served in the House of Representatives for nearly 25 years.

What do they hide? What do they fear?

I hope that the Cuban government will allow me to travel. I hope to be with the brave leaders of freedom in Cuba on this day of peaceful advocacy. The world will be watching next week Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the regime will allow this event to take place. If they fail to do so, they will continue to experience alienation from the world community.

Our hopes and prayers are with the brave leaders of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society next week. I urge my colleagues to strongly support this resolution that supports the brave advocates for freedom in Cuba.

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 193.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS OF A ROTARY INTERNATIONAL DAY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 142) supporting the goals and ideals of a

"Rotary International Day" and celebrating and honoring Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 142

Whereas Rotary International, founded on February 23, 1905, in Chicago, Illinois, is the world's first service club and one of the largest nonprofit service organizations;

Whereas there are more than 1.2 million Rotary International club members comprised of professional and business leaders in more than 31,000 clubs in more than 165 countries;

Whereas the Rotary International motto, "Service Above Self", inspires members to provide humanitarian service, meet high ethical standards, and promote international good will;

Whereas Rotary International funds club projects and sponsors volunteers with community expertise to provide medical supplies, health care, clean water, food production, job training, and education to millions in need, particularly in developing countries;

Whereas in 1985, Rotary International launched Polio Plus and spearheaded efforts with the World Health Organization, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the United Nations Children's Fund ("UNICEF") to immunize the children of the world against polio;

Whereas polio cases have dropped by 99 percent since 1988, and the world now stands on the threshold of eradicating the disease;

Whereas Rotary International is the largest privately-funded source of international scholarships in the world and promotes international understanding through scholarships, exchange programs, and humanitarian grants;

Whereas since 1947, more than 35,000 students from 110 countries have studied abroad as Rotary Ambassadorial Scholars;

Whereas Rotary International's Group Study Exchange program has helped more than 46,000 young professionals explore career fields in other countries;

Whereas 8,000 secondary school students each year experience life in another country through Rotary International's Youth Exchange Program;

Whereas over the past five years, members throughout all fifty States of Rotary International have hosted participants in Open World, a program sponsored by the Library of Congress, and therefore have earned the honor of serving as Open World's most outstanding host;

Whereas there are approximately 400,000 Rotary International club members in more than 7,700 clubs throughout the United States sponsoring service projects to address critical issues such as poverty, health, hunger, illiteracy, and the environment in their local communities and abroad; and

Whereas February 23, 2005, would be an appropriate date to observe Rotary International Day: Now, therefore, be it;

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of a "Rotary International Day" to celebrate the centennial anniversary of Rotary International; and

(2) recognizes Rotary International for 100 years of service to improving the human condition in communities throughout the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

□ 1500

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration, H. Res. 142.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the Committee on Government Reform, and as one of the 73 cosponsors, I am pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 142 that honors Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

Rotary is a global organization of business and professional leaders that provide humanitarian services and works to provide good will and peace in the world. The organization boasts approximately 1.2 million members, called Rotarians, who belong to more than 31,000 Rotary clubs currently located in 167 countries. The efforts of Rotary clubs encourage high ethical standards in all vocations.

Rotary International was founded on February 23, 1905, in Chicago, Illinois, in the hometown and the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS). It became the world's first club devoted to public service and quickly grew into one of the largest nonprofit service organizations.

Today, there are nearly 400,000 Rotarians in the U.S. Membership provides the opportunity to make a difference within communities by working with each other and with local humanitarian and business leaders. A person can even learn about and become involved in international issues through Rotary programs.

Madam Speaker, next month, I understand that the Rotary will be hosting a great celebration in Chicago to mark its hundredth anniversary, and it will be from June 18 to June 22. On this occasion, the 2005 Rotary International convention will be a great event, and we wish the best to the Rotary and all Rotarians in their festivities.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her benevolence in advancing such a worthy resolution. I congratulate Rotary International for 100 years of tremendous service to our Nation and to the world.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As the author of this legislation, and with the honor of representing the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois, home to the headquarters of Rotary International, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 142, a bill marking 100 years of service to humanity by Rotarians around the world. I am so happy that the other body, under the leadership of our Illinois Senator, RICHARD DURBIN, also passed an identical resolution.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform for their assistance in moving this bill to the floor, and my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), for his support of this legislation.

The celebration of Rotary's centennial will culminate in the place where it all began, Chicago, during the organization's upcoming convention to be held in mid-June. There, Rotarians from all over the world will mark 100 years of service to humanity and to rededicate themselves to Rotary's ongoing mission of service above self.

Rotary International was founded on February 23, 1905, in Chicago, Illinois. It is the world's first service club and one of the largest nonprofit service organizations in the world. Rotary provides humanitarian services, encourages high ethical standards in all vocations, and helps build good will and peace in the world.

Approximately 1.2 million Rotarians belong to more than 31,000 Rotary clubs located in 167 countries. Approximately 400,000 Rotarians belong to clubs throughout the United States and in virtually every congressional district. The world's Rotary clubs meet weekly and are nonpolitical, nonreligious, and open to all cultures, all races, and all creeds.

The main objective of Rotary is service in the community, in the workplace, and throughout the world. Rotarians develop community service projects that address many of today's most critical issues, such as children at risk, poverty and hunger, the environment, illiteracy, and violence. They also support programs for youth, educational opportunities, and international exchanges for students, teachers and other professionals, and vocational career development.

The Rotary motto of "Service Above Self" is an example for all humanity, and certainly one for the Members of this body. Today, Rotarians are united in a campaign for the global eradication of polio. In the 1980s, Rotarians raised \$240 million to immunize the children of the world. By the end of 2005, the Polio Plus program will have contributed \$500 million to this cause. Rotary has provided an army of volunteers to promote and assist at national immunization days in polio endemic countries around the world.

In 2000, I had the privilege of traveling to India with President Clinton

and happened to be there on a weekend when Rotary was doing immunizations of children in India against polio. Along with many coalition partners, the Rotarians succeeded in immunizing approximately 125 million people in a weekend. Imagine the kind of volunteer effort it took for such a massive campaign and for such great results.

Due in large part to Rotary's efforts, the number of polio cases has fallen from an estimated 350,000 in 1988 to less than 1,300 in 2004, a more than 99 percent decline in reported cases. More than 200 countries and territories are polio-free.

From the launch of the global initiative in 1988 to the eradication target date of 2005, five million people who would otherwise have been paralyzed will be walking because they have been immunized against polio. It is my hope that today we will not only pass this resolution but that we will also dedicate ourselves to meeting Rotary International's call for adequate funding for the fight against polio in 2006.

Rotary is seeking a total of \$106.4 million for the polio eradication efforts of the CDC and \$32 million for the polio eradication activities of USAID. This Congress should support Rotary's great work by providing those needed funds.

Rotary International shares the mission that drives so many of us in this body. Rotary International promotes world understanding through international and humanitarian service programs and educational and cultural exchanges. It is supported solely by volunteer contributions from Rotarians and others who share its vision of a better world. Since 1947, the foundation has awarded more than \$1.1 billion in humanitarian and educational grants.

Again, I want to urge my colleagues to join me in passing this legislation in honoring the work and members of Rotary International for 100 years of service to humanity and for their role in improving the world. I hope over the next 100 years Rotary's membership will continue to grow and its great service will continue.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from the State of Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), who is also a Rotarian.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me this time, and I want to commend the gentlewoman from Illinois for her fine work on this piece of legislation, and I would like to encourage my colleagues to all join me in supporting House Resolution 142 and honoring the goals and the ideals of Rotary International and Rotary International Day on their hundredth anniversary. It is a wonderful organization.

Growing up, I learned that giving back to your community should be a goal that each and every one of us would have. And with its "Service Above Self" motto, Rotary International truly is living up to that

standard of giving back. As an active Rotarian, I have had the opportunity to participate in so many events, programs, and projects that have been carried out by my Rotary club and by other Rotary clubs in my congressional district in Tennessee.

The gentlewoman from Illinois spoke a little about some of those projects, and it does not matter if you are in Nashville or Memphis or Clarksville, or anywhere in the Seventh District of Tennessee or around our great State, you are going to see that Rotary clubs are making a difference in each and every kind of project, from immunizations for children, which is a worldwide project for Rotaries, and then to things like the National Rotary Club, supporting the Boys and Girls Club and Second Harvest Food Bank, and providing scholarships. Also, in Memphis, they have awarded thousands of dollars in small grants to teachers who are working to improve literacy in that great city.

I want to send my thanks to the 1.2 million Rotary club members who are working to make that difference in communities around the globe, and I want to commend our international Rotarians who are now in 165 different countries for their commitment to service above self and improving the quality of life for each and every man and woman.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. It is with great pleasure I join with my colleagues and friends in support of H. Res. 142, supporting the goals and ideals of a Rotary International Day and celebrating and honoring Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial celebration.

Rotary International is one of the most well-known and respected service organizations in the world. What many people do not know, however, is that the organization began in 1905, when Paul Harris, a Chicago attorney, invited three friends to a meeting: Silvester Schiele, a coal dealer; Hiram Shorey, a merchant tailor; and Gustavus Loehr, a mining engineer. All four men gathered in Loehr's business office in room 711 of the Unity Building at 127 North Dearborn, in my district of downtown Chicago. They discussed Harris' idea that business leaders should meet periodically to enjoy camaraderie and to enlarge their circle of business and professional acquaintances.

The club met weekly. Membership was limited to one representative from each business and profession. And though the men did not use the term "rotary" that night, that gathering is commonly regarded as the first Rotary club meeting. The name Rotary was suggested later by Paul Harris, as meetings were rotated from one office in the early days of the organization to another.

As the Rotary club began to grow nationwide, the focus of the club expanded from simply serving the profes-

sional and social needs of its club members to trying to address the problems that existed in their communities. Since its inception, Rotary International has been a source of inspiration to people all over the world. In 1945, 49 Rotary members served in 29 delegations to the United Nations Charter Conference. Today, the Rotary club is still an active participant in several United Nations programs.

In addition to their commitment to diplomacy, Rotarians have taken the lead on many international crises. In 1985, they made a commitment to immunize all of the world's children for polio. To this day, Rotary is the largest private-sector contributor to the global polio eradication program.

As we honor Rotary International for their profound contributions to our world, I am pleased to say that the organization continues to grow. Today, 1.2 million Rotarians belong to 31,000 Rotary clubs in 166 countries.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to take this moment to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), for her leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. I would also like to thank the members of the Rotary club for serving our communities and helping to make the world a better place for all of us to live in.

Madam Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Illinois (Mr. KIRK), who is also a Rotarian.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time; and I commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), for offering this resolution commending Rotary on its anniversary, headquartered in Evanston, Illinois, on Chicago's North Shore.

In 1905, in Chicago, Illinois attorney Paul Harris invited three friends to dinner. He envisioned a new kind of group of professionals that would meet to cultivate their civic ties. The group met regularly, became the Rotary Club of Chicago, and changed its focus to community service.

We have come a long way since 1905. Now, with 400,000 Rotarians, like the Highland Park Morning Rotary Club that I belong to, and over 7,000 clubs throughout the United States, they are fighting poverty and hunger and illiteracy and working to support the environment. But Rotary should be known especially for one project, Polio Plus.

□ 1515

It is with this privately funded and organized group that dedicated itself to wiping out a disease from the face of the planet, building on the precedent of wiping out smallpox, Rotary chose to wipe out polio which crippled our President Roosevelt and many other Americans. With this massive immuni-

zation program, joined in with the United Nations and the U.S. Government, Rotary's vision has now led us to a world where 99 percent of polio has been eradicated. In just a few years' time, Rotary is going to give a great gift to the world. It is a world without polio. It embodies Rotary's motto, Service Above Self, giving a victory and a gift to all future generations.

The House here commends Rotary and I commend my colleague for bringing this, headquartered on Chicago's North Shore, embodying the great American civic spirit.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to support the goals and ideals of Rotary International Day. The Rotary Foundation has led the Global Effort to eradicate polio by vaccinating every child in the world. They have sent scholars, teachers and tradesmen from every nation to every nation to serve as ambassadors of goodwill to promote peace and understanding. They are leaders in their community, in business and in government. They are entrepreneurs that further the American economy and American ideals, and I thank them.

In my own district of Houston Texas, the Rotary Club of Gulfway-Hobby Airport engages in a number of charitable projects throughout the year. Founded on January 22, 1951, the South Houston Rotary Club was organized that night and was off and running with George Washington Christy being installed as the first president. Gulfway-Hobby Airport Rotary Club, over this 50 years plus time span, has been one of the most active, "Service Above Self" clubs in District 5890.

Their biggest charitable event is called Challenge Air and is held annually. The Rotary Club, with the support of the local aviation community provides pilots, airplanes, food, and gifts for wheelchair bound students. Held on a weekend, the students are given the opportunity to visit the hanger of one of the fixed base operators at Hobby Airport and then are taken for flights over Houston in private planes.

In addition, the Gulfway-Hobby Airport Rotary Club hosts a New Years Eve Party at Golden Age Manor Nursing Home and provides \$8,000-\$16,000 in academic scholarships awarded to local high school graduates.

Organizations such as these are invaluable to our communities, and we must do what we can to support and encourage their activities.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 142, Supporting the Goals and Ideals of a "Rotary International Day" and celebrating and honoring Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

Since 1905 when the first Rotary Club was founded in Chicago by Paul Harris, Rotarians have been dedicated to the principle of "Service above Self." Though this principle has been embodied in various ways and mottos throughout Rotary's history, this ethic of service has always been rooted at the core of the organization and in the hearts of Rotarians throughout the world. Today 1.2 million Rotarians put service above self in more than 30,100 Clubs in over 160 countries.

In 1985 Rotary International launched PolioPlus, a program to immunize all the world's children against polio by the centennial anniversary of Rotary's founding. To date, the

PolioPlus program has committed more than \$500 million to the protection of more than two billion children in 122 countries. These funds are providing much needed polio vaccine, operational support, medical personnel, laboratory equipment and educational materials for health workers and patients.

With its community-based network worldwide, Rotary is the volunteer arm of the global partnership dedicated to eradicating polio. Rotary volunteers assist in vaccine delivery, social mobilization, logistical help and other services which cannot be quantified in dollars alone.

From the earliest days of the organization, Rotarians were concerned with promoting high ethical standards in their professional lives. One of the world's most widely printed and quoted statements of business ethics is The Four-Way Test, which was created in 1932 by Rotarian Herbert J. Taylor. Rotarians challenge themselves in their daily lives to ask the following four questions of the things they think, say or do: 1. Is it the truth? 2. Is it fair to all concerned? 3. Will it build goodwill and better friendships? 4. Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

In the forty-ninth Congressional district alone Rotary International is represented by the Rotary Clubs of Vista, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Oceanside, Valley Center, Perris, Murrieta, Temecula, Temecula Sunrise, Sun City—Menifee and Lake Elsinore.

Rotary is among the finest of organizations and I join in celebrating with all Rotarians the one hundredth anniversary of their founding and wish them another one hundred years of success.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 142 to support the goals and ideals of 'Rotary International Day' and to celebrate and honor Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

Rotary began in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands with what was called non-district clubs. The first non-district club to receive a charter was The Rotary Club of St. Thomas in 1957, followed by The Rotary Club of St. Croix in 1958 and from their inception they emphasized their commitment of Service Above Self.

Rotary West of St. Croix for example has provided (5) \$1,000 scholarship for graduating seniors from St. Croix high schools for over 25 years. They have also donated over 350 wheelchairs to residents of St. Croix and Haiti, and provided over 3 trailers loads of dry goods to the residents of Grenada in the wake of the disaster they suffered last year. Just this past March, they presented a \$10,000 check to Juan Luis Hospital to help the facility purchase an EEG machine.

On St. Thomas, three 2004 graduates of the Ivanna Eudora Kean High School were given full four-year scholarship awards to attend the University of the Virgin Islands, thanks to Rotary Club of St. Thomas East. St. Thomas' Rotary East works closely with students at Eudora Kean, its adopted school, year-round and at the end of the year it awards up to four scholarships to deserving graduates. With Rotary International in its 100th year, each club is mandated to create a special project. For its Centennial project, Rotary East created a tropical arboretum with the help of Kean students, planting 100 trees on the school's campus concentrating on native species, such as pink cedar and sea grape trees.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that Rotary International and the U.S. Coalition for the Eradication of Polio have chosen to recognize me as a 2003 Rotary "Congressional Champion of Polio Eradication. The drive to eradicate polio has been one of the largest private-public sector initiatives ever organized. Rotary International has been working since 1985 to help eradicate polio from the world and it is now possible. They have mobilized tens of thousands of Rotarians to work together with their national ministries of health, UNICEF and the World Health Organization, and with health providers at the grassroots level in thousands of communities. By the time polio has been eradicated, Rotary International will have expended more than \$500 million of its own money on the effort.

I am pleased to support H. Res. 142 and applaud Rotary International for all of their good work in service to their community. I urge my colleagues to support passage of the resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, let me take this means to congratulate Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

The world's first service club, the Rotary Club of Chicago, was formed on February 23, 1905, by Paul P. Harris. Through the years, Rotary's popularity has spread across the nation and the world and its mission has expanded well beyond serving the professional interests of local chapters.

Rotary has been instrumental in pooling resources to assist communities in need across the world. In 1985, Rotary made an historic commitment to immunize all of the world's children against polio. Working in partnership with nongovernmental organizations and national governments, Rotary is the largest private-sector contributor to the global polio eradication campaign. In fact, in 2005, Rotarians joined with representatives from global health networks to mark the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Dr. Jonas Salk's polio vaccine as safe and effective.

Rotary has also worked to meet the changing needs of society, addressing critical problems surrounding illiteracy, world hunger, and at risk children.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited countless Rotary Clubs throughout Missouri's Fourth Congressional District. On each occasion, I am humbled by the hard work and friendly spirit of the community leaders who belong to this organization.

I congratulate them on 100 years of community service and I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 142.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 142, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a "Rotary International Day" and celebrating and honoring Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

Today we commemorate the 100th anniversary of Rotary International and express our appreciation for the organization's service to our congressional districts, including my district of El Paso, Texas. Rotary International's service also extends to people around the globe, with 1.2 million Rotarians at 31,000 Rotary clubs in 167 countries.

The El Paso Rotary Club has served my district since 1914. Mr. Frank Hoy, President of the El Paso Rotary Club, leads a group of 300 members that conducts many important

activities throughout the year that are of great benefit to our community. I am pleased to be participating in their annual Independence Day parade again this year.

Madam Speaker, I sincerely congratulate Rotary International and the El Paso Rotary Club on this important occasion, and I thank them for their continued service to the 16th District of Texas, our Nation, and the world.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 142, supporting the goals and ideals of a "Rotary International Day" and celebrating and honoring Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

On Rotary International's 100th anniversary, we celebrate their extraordinary contributions to communities around the world. A worldwide organization of business and professional leaders, Rotary provides humanitarian service, encourages high ethical standards in all vocations, and helps build goodwill and peace in the world.

This extraordinary organization is the world's first service club and one of the largest nonprofit service organizations. Dedicated to their motto "Service Above Self," Rotary has maintained their focus on service. In fact, to celebrate their 100th Anniversary, Rotary designated April 2005 "Centennial Service Above Self Volunteer Month." Each club member was encouraged to volunteer at least 10 hours of personal time in service to others, focusing on meeting community needs, lending vocational expertise, and assisting communities abroad.

As Co-Chair of the Congressional National Service Caucus, I am grateful for Rotary's commitment to our communities. Approximately 1.2 million Rotarians belong to more than 31,000 Rotary clubs, which fund club projects and sponsor volunteers to provide medical supplies, health care, clean water, food production, job training, and education to millions in need, particularly in developing countries.

I am proud to have Rotary International Clubs in 14 towns in my District, including Bridgeport, Darien, Fairfield, Greenwich, Byram-Cos Cob, Derby-Shelton, Monroe, New Canaan, Norwalk, Ridgefield, Seymour-Oxford, Trumbull, Westport and Wilton.

I congratulate Rotary International and its members on the occasion of their centennial celebration and urge passage of this resolution.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 142, a resolution commending the goals and ideals of Rotary International as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. Rotary International is a network of professionals who have pooled their talents in pursuit of improving the communities in which they live. I also commend the four Rotary International clubs on Guam that have provided leadership and set a high standard for service that is very much appreciated by our community.

As America's first service organization, Rotary International embraces the ideal of providing for the wellbeing of the community before self. Today, Rotary International continues to expand its reach across continents to foster international understanding, and is now active in one hundred sixty-seven countries. One of Rotary International's current initiatives, the Polio Plus program, will immunize children throughout the world against polio. Since the

implementation of Polio Plus, the Rotary International has, in cooperation with other multinational organizations such as the United Nations World Health Organization, managed to reduce the number of polio cases worldwide by ninety-nine percent. Other successful humanitarian endeavors include bringing treatment for preventing blindness to indigent patients in the Philippines, building schools in Turkey, and providing educational fellowships and grants for young people.

Rotary International has dedicated significant resources to funding its fellowship and scholarship programs for citizens interested in studying abroad and pursuing scholarly work in global conflict resolution. Educational and community outreach to young citizens are examples of Rotary International's commitment to fostering international understanding and its belief that the virtue of volunteerism will provide positive change in the world at-large.

I would like to commend Rotary International for its service to the international community and continued efforts to assist underserved populations of the world. Its vision of global understanding and commitment to service are truly noble core values. I also want to specifically congratulate the Rotary International clubs established in Guam, as well as their respective club presidents, for the hard work and commitment to community service that they have demonstrated over the years. They are: Dr. Ron McNinch, Tumon Bay; Mr. Mike Perrin, Guam; Mr. Curtis Dancoe, Guam Sunrise; and Mr. Lee Yudin, Northern Guam. I also want to extend my appreciation to the Assistant District Governor for the Pacific Basin Group, George Benoit.

Today we honor the Rotary International organization, which embodies the principle that we must, as individuals, strive for goals greater than our own self interest. Through community service, we can help form a world that is a better place to live for all of us. Congratulations to Rotary International. To the Rotary Club of Guam, the Rotary Club of Tumon Bay, the Rotary Club of Guam Sunrise and the Rotary Club of Northern Guam, thank you very much for all you have done to promote community values in Guam.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, again, I am pleased to be associated with House Resolution 142. I urge all of my distinguished colleagues to support its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 142.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 86

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SOAP BOX DERBY RACES ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the "Association") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races, on the Capitol Grounds on June 18, 2005, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that the Association shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Association is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event to be carried out under this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 86 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 64th annual Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to take place on June 18, 2005.

Dating back to 1933, when a newspaper photographer witnessed three local boys racing engine-less cars down a neighborhood hill, the soap box derby has become an example of classic Americana. Over the years, the idea to hold a neighborhood race has grown from a local race where competitors

raced anything with wheels to win a trophy to a nationwide extravaganza complete with three soap box divisions, official sponsors and the opportunity to travel and win college scholarships.

More importantly, however, is the work that goes into these soap box racers. Building a racer gives children valuable experience working with their hands and challenging their minds, learning about aerodynamics, craftsmanship and attention to detail. With three divisions and races all over the world, there is a place for everyone to try their hand at soap box building.

It took several years for this hobby to catch on in Washington, D.C., but after more than seven decades of racing, the tradition of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby continues to encourage youth between the ages of 8 and 17 to develop their building, design and creativity skills. The winners of each division will represent the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area in the National Soap Box Derby to be held in Akron, Ohio, on July 30, 2005.

The races will take place on Constitution Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Third Street, Northwest, and will be free of charge to the public. The resolution also authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association, the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the event in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds. The sponsor assumes responsibility for all expenses and liabilities related to the event. I support the resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to stand here on behalf of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that has jurisdiction over this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the sponsor of this legislation who, each year, has offered this resolution and has been a strong supporter of the soap box derby.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for yielding time, and I thank her for her leadership on bringing this bill to the floor. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well on getting this bill to the floor early. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, I know, has worked with us on so many different matters. I thank her very much for making sure this happens.

Madam Speaker, for the 15th straight year, I am proud to sponsor the resolution allowing the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to hold its annual race on the grounds of the United States Capitol. They could not

do so without this legislation. H. Con. Res. 86 authorizes the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board to work with the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to ensure that all the necessary arrangements are made to conduct this race in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds. The 64th annual Greater Washington Soap Box Derby will be held on Saturday, June 18.

Since 1991, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association has held its race on the Capitol Grounds. Each year, it attracts over 50 racers, both boys and girls, ranging in age from 8 to 17. These young people work very hard to build their own gravity-powered race cars from a kit provided by the All-American Soap Box Derby program. What a great name, All-American Soap Box Derby, because it is, of course, true that like apple pie and motherhood, soap box derby rings so true to all Americans. Participating in the soap box derby provides contestants with an opportunity to learn basic building skills and a sense of accomplishment. Racers are divided into three divisions, stock, super stock and masters. The local winner of each division automatically qualifies to compete with racers from around the world in the All-American soap box derby. This year's race will be held on July 30 in Akron, Ohio, where every year since 1936, except during World War II, young people have gathered to race.

The festivities in Akron begin when the racers receive a police escort into town and conclude in the winner's circle with the awarding of scholarships and merchandise. In between, the racers and their families participate in a whirlwind of activities that leave them with enduring friendships and memories that I am sure will last a lifetime. Madam Speaker, I am honored that all three of last year's winners of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby were from my congressional district from the Washington competition: Haley Luense of Accokeek, Robbie Reuss of Waldorf and Robert McDaniel of Bowie. They were not winners of the national competition but they were participants and did well.

Madam Speaker, this event has been called and I quote, the greatest amateur racing event in the world. There may be a dispute on that from time to time, but it is a wonderful opportunity for our children from the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia to venture into the world of engineering while experiencing the spirit of competition.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join with me and the other original cosponsors, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) in supporting this resolution. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for her leadership in assuring that this bill gets to the floor in a timely fashion so that we will be ready for June 18.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am delighted to join with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) in support of House Concurrent Resolution 86. In particular, I do want to acknowledge the efforts of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) who has consistently been a champion for his constituents in ensuring that this event take place each year.

House Concurrent Resolution 86 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. On June 18, 2005, youngsters from the greater Washington area who are between 9 and 16 will test the principles of aerodynamics as they race down Constitution Avenue in their soap box vehicles that they have designed and constructed.

Madam Speaker, many hundreds of volunteers donate considerable time supporting the event and providing families with a fun-filled day, which is quickly becoming a tradition in the Washington, D.C., area. The event has grown in popularity, and Washington is now known as one of the outstanding race cities in the Nation. Consistent with all events using the Capitol Grounds, this event is open to the public and free of charge. The organizers will work with the Capitol Hill Police and the Office of the Architect. I support House Concurrent Resolution 86 and urge support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, the annual soap box derby is one of the most constructive activities that the Congress can support in behalf of young people and truly for families. As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has already explained and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) has explained, constructing these vehicles brings together families, brings out the creative instincts of young people, gives them an opportunity to innovate and to produce a product in which they have ownership and which takes a great deal of time and which brings families together. Supporting the annual soap box derby, we are doing something truly constructive for families, for the Nation's capital young people and for young people across America.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules

and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 86.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 135) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 135

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.

On June 10, 2005, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 2005 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the "event") may be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics summer games.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 135 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 20th annual District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to take place on June 10, 2005. The Special Olympics is an international organization dedicated to using athletics to impact the lives of children and adults with intellectual disabilities. Funds raised through projects like the Law Enforcement Torch Run make it possible for athletes with disabilities to train and compete year round.

The Special Olympics offers something that is seldom offered to these individuals. It creates an environment where persons with disabilities are

fully accepted, encouraged and empowered. Through training and competition, Special Olympics athletes grow mentally and physically, improving their physical fitness and motor skills and ultimately gaining greater self-confidence. With more than 85,000 law enforcement officers carrying the flame across 35 nations, the 2004 Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run raised more than \$20.5 million. This event has historically been the largest and most successful Special Olympics grassroots fundraiser and awareness vehicle, and with the authorization of House Concurrent Resolution 135, we will ensure its continued success.

The sponsors of the event will work with the Architect of the Capitol and the United States Capitol Police to comply with all the applicable regulations relating to the use of the Capitol Grounds and will assume responsibility for all expenses and liabilities related to the event.

□ 1530

I encourage my colleagues to join the law enforcement community in supporting the Special Olympics and join me in supporting this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this event needs little introduction. 2005 marks the 38th anniversary of the District Special Olympics. The torch relay event is a traditional part of the opening ceremonies for the Special Olympics, which will take place at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia. This event has become a highlight on Capitol Hill and is an integral part of the Special Olympics.

In the early 1960s, Eunice Kennedy Shriver started a day camp for people with mental retardation, and the Special Olympics were born. The games help mentally challenged individuals gain confidence and self-esteem through friendly competition in a supportive environment.

Today, more than 1 million children and adults with special needs participate in the Special Olympics programs worldwide. Here in our Nation's capital, approximately 2,500 Special Olympians compete in dozens of events each year, and they are cheered on by their family members and friends. This inspirational event is due in large part to the efforts of thousands of volunteers from the greater Washington, D.C. area. And these individuals deserve our thanks and our assistance.

I enthusiastically support this resolution and the very worthwhile endeavor of the Special Olympics. I urge support for House Concurrent Resolution 135.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking member on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and, again, the committee for bringing this concurrent resolution to the House floor, as is our annual responsibility, to authorize the use of the Capitol grounds for the Special Olympic Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The gentlewoman and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), representing the majority, have well explained the purpose of the Special Olympics and the Torch Run. But I just want to take a moment to pay tribute to Sarge Shriver, who for so many years has been the inspiration behind, and the organizational force of, the Special Olympics. It really has become synonymous with Sarge Shriver. This event, which has become so widely admired, so greatly appreciated, has just made an enormous difference for young, middle-aged and older mentally disabled persons, reinforcing their self-confidence, building self-esteem, and improving the quality of their health as they prepare for and participate in the Special Olympics.

From time to time on Sunday I see Sarge Shriver at our Lady of Mercy Parish where I participate in mass when I am in the Washington Area. It just pains me as I see Sarge Shriver overcome by the mental ravages of Alzheimer's. Even with this dreadful disease he certainly functions well, and his body is strong, and his mind is clear. But one can see the ravages of this dreaded ailment. And for one who has given so much to so many people for so many years, it just brings home to me every time I see him this enormous contribution that he has made so selflessly over the many years.

Eunice Shriver, who took over the Kennedy family initiative on behalf of the mentally disabled, played a strong, forceful role in my hometown with the publisher of our hometown newspaper, Veda Ponikvar, in building and commissioning the Range Center for the mentally retarded, bringing people who have been neglected, held in homes, shut away in closets and downstairs rooms and attics and bringing them out into the world and giving them an opportunity for self-esteem, for self-confidence, to learn skills, to be productive members of our community.

And so across the country, those who have been helped by the Shriver family and the Kennedy inspiration for the programs to support those with mental disabilities, the Special Olympics stands out as the premier activity nationwide to give respect, recognition, full membership in society to those not so fortunate as the rest of us.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 135.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 136) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 136

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary (in this resolution referred to as the "sponsor") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 24th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (in this resolution referred to as the "event"), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2004.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on May 15, 2005, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms.

SCHWARTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 136 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service to take place on May 15, 2005. The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary are the sponsors wishing to honor some of America's bravest men and women. The memorial service will honor the 154 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting their communities in 2004.

I would especially like to recognize the seven peace officers killed in the line of duty in 2004 from my home State of Pennsylvania.

This is the 24th time that this event has been held on the grounds of the Capitol. This memorial service is part of National Police Week, which was created by law in 1962; and this year begins today and continues until May 15.

Police Week draws officers, their families, and the survivors of fallen officers from around the country and includes such events as the Blue Mass at St. Patrick's Catholic Church, a candlelight vigil at the National Law Enforcement Memorial, and a police unity tour featuring officers and historic vehicles.

This event begins at noon on Sunday and, following the ceremony on the Capitol grounds, will continue with a procession to the Law Enforcement Memorial followed by a wreath-laying ceremony.

I encourage my colleagues to attend this much-deserved memorial service to honor those who are on the front lines, protecting the communities we live in, and work to serve.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 136 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the 24th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, a most solemn and respectful public event honoring our Nation's brave civil servants. The event, scheduled for May 15, will be coordinated by the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Hill Police.

This is a fitting tribute to the Federal, State, and local police officers who gave their lives while protecting our families, our homes, and our places of work. This year, 153 names will be added to the memorial wall, including nine women who were killed in the line of duty. These fallen heroes served an average of 12 years in law enforcement, with some serving as many as 40 years. Others, like one 20-year-old officer, had only just begun what he had hoped would be years of service to his community.

On average, one officer is killed in this country every other day, and approximately 23,000 are injured every year. And thousands more are assaulted while on duty. In 2004, seven law enforcement officers from the State of Pennsylvania were killed in the line of duty.

In the early morning hours of March 19, Philadelphia City Pretrial Warrant Supervisor Joseph LeClaire was shot and killed while serving an arrest warrant in West Germantown to a man who had failed to appear in court during two trials, one for a drug charge, the second for a rape case. Officers Vincent Disandra and Carlo Delborrello were also shot and wounded during the encounter.

Shortly after 11 a.m. on March 31 in Bradford County, Deputy Sheriffs Christopher Burgert, who was 30, and Michael Vankuren, 36, were shot and killed while trying to serve two warrants to a man living in Wells Township.

In the early morning of April 20, Sergeant James Miller, a 28-year veteran of the Upper Dublin Police Department, died when his police vehicle rolled over during an accident.

And Police Chief Douglas Shertzer, a 23-year veteran of his department, was killed in a motorcycle accident on the morning of May 11 while en route to begin his patrol.

Patrolman Michael Wise II of Reading City Police Department was shot in the line of duty on the night of June 5 while searching for a murder suspect.

And, finally, Elk Lick Township Police Chief Sheridan Caton, 60, was killed in a head-on collision while responding to a request for a backup from a neighboring police department. The driver of the second vehicle was charged with driving while under the influence.

These public servants are sorely missed; and they deserve our deepest respect, and their families have our most sincere sympathies.

In October, 1962, President Kennedy declared May 15 as National Peace Officers' Memorial Day so that we could come together to honor the service and sacrifice of our Nation's law enforcement officers. This year's ceremony is the 24th anniversary of this memorial service. Consistent with all Capitol Hill events, the memorial service will be free and open to the public.

I support the resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this tribute to our fallen police officers and peace officers.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in support of the concurrent resolution. On May 15, 2005, America will observe National Peace Officers' Memorial Day and hold the National Memorial Service. We commemorate this day each year to honor the heroes of law enforcement who have lost their lives in the line of duty. As the Ranking Democrat on the Committee on House Administration, which has jurisdiction over the U.S. Capitol Police, the Library of Congress Police, and the Government Printing

Office Police, this year's observance has additional significance for me. On this occasion, I rise to offer the tribute of the Californians I have the honor to represent, and my Committee's, as well as my own.

The need for such a memorial day arose in the earliest days of our republic. Since America's first line-of-duty death was recorded in 1792, more than 16,500 men and women have fallen, including three Capitol Police officers, one in 1984, and two in 1998. Nationwide, 153 officers died in the line of duty last year, 13 of them in California, according to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. Thus, in 2004, somewhere in the United States a law-enforcement officer fell in the line of duty ever 57 hours.

I wish it were not so, Madam Speaker. We all wish it were not so. But at least 35 have already fallen in 2005, and still others will follow. If anyone among us could do anything to prevent even one more law-enforcement officer's death, we would surely do it. I certainly hope that this Congress, every state legislature, and every other policymaking body will do everything possible to prevent more such deaths.

Madam Speaker, as we pause on this year's National Peace Officers' Memorial Day to reflect upon the sacrifices made by the valiant men and women of law enforcement who have given their lives for our communities, let us resolve to cherish their memory on May 15 and every day. Let us also honor the brave men and women now working across this land who may, at any moment of any shift, give their lives to make us safe. Let us resolve to show them our respect and gratitude every day of the year. I urge all Members to vote for the resolution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 136, to authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service on May 15, 2005.

In October 1962, President Kennedy proclaimed May 15th as National Peace Officers' Memorial Day. Each year on this date we, as a Nation, have an opportunity to honor the devotion with which peace officers perform their daily task of protecting our families, co-workers, friends, and each of us. The 2005 event marks the 24th anniversary of the Capitol Hill event. In the post September 11th environment, the work of selfless police and firemen has become our model of courage and moral strength.

There are approximately 700,000 sworn law enforcement officers serving the American public today. Officers work for states, counties, U.S. territories, federal enforcement, military police, and corrections departments. Ten percent of law enforcement officers are women.

During 2004, 153 peace officers were killed in the line of duty; of those killed, nine were women. The average age of those killed in the line of duty was 37 years.

It is most fitting and proper to honor the lives, sacrifices, and public service of these brave men and women. I urge support for H. Con. Res. 136.

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 136. 7

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 86, House Concurrent Resolution 135, and House Concurrent Resolution 136, the matters just considered by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m.

□ 1740

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On the basis of House Report 109-51 and certain media coverage thereof, the gentlewoman may rise to a question of personal privilege under rule IX.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in the integrity of this House, the specialness of this House, and the specialness of my colleagues.

I also believe that this time that I will have to share with my colleagues and to share with the American people is a moment for us to be able to move forward and not to recount or to go back over a pathway that is not productive.

A few weeks ago we were discussing legislation that of its very name is extremely controversial. In the course of that legislation, H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, CIANA, the debate was vigorous; and I

know that in this Congress we have had our differences of opinion as it relates to the question of choice, the ninth amendment, the right to privacy, and, in this instance, the question of parental consent.

It is interesting to note that those of us who may side on the position of choice and the right to privacy recognize the intensity and the questions being raised about children who are put in harm's way, whether or not that means that a child without counsel, because of some tragedy in her life, has to seek an abortion.

The vigorousness of the debate centered around the idea of the enormous range of differences of opinion expressed by different States. I think they are equally divided, 23, 22, 27, some States having no provisions for parental consent as it relates to a child securing an abortion, some States having a very complicated process with judicial review, and some States having a medium process.

The debate in the Committee on the Judiciary by members on my side of the aisle really centered and focused on the structure of the legislation that seemingly would close the door shut on a child that would seek counsel beyond the parent in this very troubling time in their life. It also sought to clarify whether an innocent bystander who could provide a mode of transportation might, in fact, be held criminally liable under this particular law. So there were a number of amendments being offered that would hopefully clarify this very difficult question.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time when passions rise high, temperatures rise high as well. As I said, there is a vigorous disagreement about this question of abortion and even more vigorous when it involves a child who is under the age of majority.

□ 1745

So there were a number of amendments offered by my colleagues, one offered that, in particular the description of the amendment simply offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), allowed an adult who could be prosecuted under the bill go to a Federal court and seek a waiver to the State's parental notice laws if this remedy was not available.

Subsequently, there was a House Report, 109-51, and in that report, a series of amendments were described in particular to give license to sexual predators. May I repeat that again, Mr. Speaker, to give license to sexual predators.

I started out by saying, and I do intend to follow that charge that I have made, that this is an effort to go forward, to be able to highlight a mistake, an indiscretion, a pathway that hopefully we will not return to and allow us to heal on our own, if you will, but also to cite that this is not the way to run the People's House.

That amendment simply stated that it allowed an adult who could be pros-

ecuted under the bill to go to the Federal District Court and seek a waiver to the State's parental notice laws. Remember I started out, Mr. Speaker, by saying State parental notice laws are varying around the Nation. It was ultimately written to suggest that that particular gentleman from New York had an amendment that would have created an additional layer of Federal Court review that could be used by sexual predators to escape conviction under the bill. It suggested that that roll call, that particular amendment, was defeated 11 to 16.

Subsequently, there was another amendment by the gentleman from New York to exempt a grandparent or adult sibling from the criminal and civil provisions in the bill, again, simply stated as plain as can be. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, though I am not intending to challenge legislation that has already been passed on the floor of the House, albeit I disagree with it vigorously in terms of the restraints it puts on the interaction between a child and confidante, a trusted adult who can help steer them in the right direction, let me just suggest this was a constructive amendment because it was to give the child an ability to consult with someone that may be out of the pipeline and be out of the child's distress area, meaning we have never looked at the point that possibly the parent could be the predator or could be engaged in incest. All of these are terrible things to discuss, but in a responsible debate, these were the considerations why these amendments were authored.

Ultimately, that amendment to allow a grandparent or sibling to confide or that child to confide in that particular adult or that particular sibling, adult sibling, it was described by the gentleman's amendment, was described as having exempted sexual predators from prosecution under the bill and suggested that it was defeated in a roll call vote.

Subsequently, the gentleman from Virginia offered an amendment to protect innocent bystanders who might have someone take their mode of transportation, a taxicab, a bus or other mode of transportation, not knowing who they are carrying, and ultimately caught up in the legislation and be prosecuted. So this was to exempt innocent bus drivers, taxicab drivers and others who would be transporting individuals, and, again, the amendment was described as exempting sexual predators.

A subsequent amendment that limited liability to the person committing the offense in the first degree was ultimately described and suggested that it would aid and abet criminals.

Then an amendment that I offered, the amendment was to exempt clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles or first cousins from the penalties in the bill, again to give a young woman a greater latitude of who to seek comfort and counsel from, and ultimately, that amendment was described, "Ms. JACKSON-LEE

offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution under the bill if they were clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles or first cousins of a minor."

Then, Mr. Speaker, though I had two separate amendments, one a GAO study that would have determined whether this particular legislation was necessary and whether or not the confusion of the States with different bases of determining parental consent, whether or not that created an added problem, the description in House Report 109-51 just lumped them all together, which reads, "that would require a study by the Government Accounting Office."

So, in essence, Mr. Speaker, my amendment was described as exempting clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles or first cousins of a minor and suggesting that I was exempting sexual predators. And then, adding insult to injury, if I might use a phrase, that I then wanted a GAO study. Completely wrong. Complete misconstruing of the amendment and of the intent.

So we had a vote last week that ultimately wound up correcting the language in some form. It did not, however, distinguish that I had two amendments and did not ask for a study of sexual predators who happened to be godparents, clergy, aunts, uncles or first cousins.

First of all, might I say in the prosecution of this particular entity, I do not believe that any prosecutor worth his or her salt would allow this legislation to exempt an individual who happened to be a relative who happened to be a sexual predator. There is no basis in the bill. And if that was the case, then it means that the parents, the very underlying crux of the bill, parental consent, it means that the bill also protects parents that are sexual predators if you follow that line of reasoning.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is an attempt to have us go forward and not backwards. The amendments were very clear on their face. The amendments stood alone: "The General Accounting Office shall conduct a study detailing the impact of the number of unsafe and illegal abortions performed on minors who would be affected by this law."

You see, Mr. Speaker, I have lived through a time when women went to back alleys, and a coat hanger was a medical device. So I thought it was appropriate that if we were going to pass a legislative initiative that we thought would help secure young lives, then we needed to have a study that would determine whether or not it was in fact securing them or endangering them. And the idea, of course, was to suggest that we needed to find out more about the impact of this legislation.

This ultimately got construed, I do not know how, as a GAO study of sexual predators. This is not a nice word to say on the floor of the House, because as we have seen the rash of attacks on our children, two young ba-

bies killed just in the last 24 hours; little precious Danielle having been decapitated and identified decapitated a couple of years ago; as cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, we were briefed by Alonzo Washington on that tragic case; the cases in Florida, the cases in Texas.

No one wants to promote the extending of any criminal exemptions for the likes of those who prey on our children. Nowhere in this GAO study would that say that. And might I say that the war against sexual predators and child predators and child sexual predators is a bipartisan war. It is not a frivolous desire of any of us to stand up against those heinous actors that will go against our children. I would not in the least be hesitant to stand alongside of any Member in this body and know full well of their undying commitment to weed out, ferret out, prosecute and incarcerate those individuals with the most evil intent to do harm to our children.

That is why a number of Members took to the floor of the House to express such outrage; not because we do not accept the fact that there could be mistakes. There are politics in this House, games that are played at all times. There is vigorous debate on the question of choice, parental consent. But it was the very fact that something so sacred, our children, could fall victim to such a divide.

As we went to the Committee on Rules we would hope it would have been cleared up through that matter. Let me also just cite the other Jackson-Lee amendment that was plain and simple, the prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles or first cousins, simply to say that they could stand in place, for example, if there was some Achilles heel, some failure in the parental structure, that this child needed to go outside of the family home. A simple process; no more, no less.

So, we had hoped that there would have been some solution to this in the Committee on Rules. As I indicated, this report was filed Thursday, April 21, and the accompanying report was 109-51.

The point that should be part of the rules of this House that I hope that we will as we go forward make really part of our institutional fabric is that House reports from now on or from last Thursday on should describe recorded votes with objective, non-argumentative captions.

The Committee on the Judiciary majority cannot do that in House Report 109-51 by captioning the five amendments that I mentioned with remarks that would suggest that we are harboring, that we are kowtowing, playing to sexual predators.

The opportunity that was given, Mr. Speaker, to address this question in the Committee on Rules was troubling, because questions were posed as to why such language was utilized.

Might I say as an aside, Mr. Speaker, you realize that the House reports and my colleagues realize the House reports are used in history. They are used by historians and political scientists, students, researchers of all kinds, policymakers. They are used to tell the story of America. That is why we rise to the floor of the House and raise our voices and consent and dissent. That is why we pay tribute to Americans on this floor. That is why, each morning, we say the Pledge of Allegiance, and the chaplain or one who has been so designated offers a word of prayer. It is for all of America to reflect and read. It is a document that leaves a legacy that 2 days from now or 5 weeks or 1 year or 10 years from now cannot be changed.

So, to ask the question why, or to suggest to my colleagues that I only stand here today to remind you that if we can find any sense of unity in this very fractured Nation and divided House and Senate, I would simply ask that it be adhering to the rules of this body and the simple reporting of the work we do here every day.

The reason why, again, I would cite this as an important request and one that I hope the correction of last week will not be simply the correction of that time, but it will be embedded that we try and work not to do it again, is because when we get on this floor, Mr. Speaker, and there are words that are not befitting or becoming of the debate, albeit the Member did not intend any wrongdoing or missteps, but because someone else found those words to be inappropriate, we have a procedure called to take the words down. Why do we do that? We do that to protect the integrity of this record.

□ 1800

And I think that is the right thing to do. In the furor of debate, sometimes we step beyond the pale. We are committed, we are passionate, we believe in what we are standing for, and we are Americans. We stand in debate with our eyes on the Flag of the United States and the words "In God We Trust." This Nation's underpinnings allow us to do so. But when sometimes in the heat of debate words flare, we are allowed, and some will ask, that the words be taken down. And in the course of the debate and the vote occurs, there is a procedure to address that issue. That means that we care about the integrity of this process and the written word that will then be there for thousands and thousands and millions and millions and years and years to be reviewed. We are owed that kind of respect.

So this statement today should not be considered an effort to recount or repeat. It is, hopefully, an effort in a moment, of evenhandedness, to suggest that this kind of mischaracterization not take place anymore in the committees of the House, the final reporting, and/or the Committee on Rules, and that we strictly stick to the conciseness and integrity of the process which

is a nonargumentative, objective reporting of the work of an individual Member.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, words such as “predator” and “sexual predator” and “child predator,” to be thrown in the direction of Members who leave their homes and their jurisdictions every day in the backdrop of some heinous criminal act, maybe affecting their own constituents, maybe some child law.

Because as I was driving on the freeway yesterday in Texas, because of the AMBER Alert that all of the Members of this House were willing to support, there unfortunately was a highlight of another kidnapped child from New Mexico, possibly on the run into Texas, not knowing whether there was an issue of sexual predator or child predator. It was a kidnapped child, a child that was vulnerable.

So it is not something that I personally take lightly, and I would just suggest that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Virginia who raised their voices, I would think that their integrity also is well-known, and that to associate their work with that definition is one that is enormously frightening.

This clarification is used as well when you can find that the entity or the act or the actions have subjected you to public ridicule. Well, a story is a story, Mr. Speaker, and this was written about. So that will not be able to be taken down. There will be articles that would suggest that amendments by the named persons exempted sexual predators. We cannot go back to that. We cannot pull that down. That is in the annals of news that will be able to be researched.

So, frankly, I thought it was enormously important that this misdeed be called again to the attention of my colleagues. Why? Because I hope going forward we will not do it again.

Allow me to quote from the ranking member of the Committee on Rules who said that it was not indicated how this was brought to our attention. The Committee on Rules discovered yesterday that the Committee on the Judiciary report on this very bill, which was authored by the majority staff, contained amendment summaries which had been rewritten by committee staff for the sole purpose of distorting the original intent of the authors. So, in essence, no one contacted our offices to be able to determine whether or not we actually intended that exemption, meaning as the report was being written. If it had not been for the staff of the Committee on Rules, we would not have had the opportunity to clear the air.

I do want to pay tribute to the Committee on Rules in this instance, Republicans and Democrats, who listened to our protest, if you will. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped and thought that that matter could be resolved there in the Committee on Rules. The response of the majority of the Com-

mittee on Rules is to stand by it, or they stood by those amendments as they were described. It appeared as stated by the ranking member that the representations being made in the Committee on Rules is that one, the majority stood by it; and, two, that the alterations to our amendments were deliberate. When asked again why such an out-of-the-ordinary approach was taken, the majority responded and suggested that it was the tone of the debate that caused such to be done. Because we oppose the legislation, the “got-you” game was being played.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise today, because I would like to have today, May 10, 2005, really be the last, last day that we would entertain such actions. No matter how vigorous the debate in opposition, how be it that we would step away from the integrity of this House, the respect for the three branches of government and do as was done. The exact quote, as I understand, and I repeat it here, the majority offered to say, “You don’t like what we wrote about your amendments, and we don’t like what you said about the bill.”

Mr. Speaker, that can take us all over the map. That is why we are in this place. That is why a President of the United States can stand with the Georgian people and talk about democracy and hold his head up high, because we are allowed to stand on the floor and vigorously disagree in a manner where we will not be punished.

So I would ask as we go forward that this kind of tone, this kind of approach not be utilized. I do not know what you would call it, but I certainly know that it has no place here.

So the resolution that was offered and debated on asked for a number of actions. I think now I should applaud one of the actions. In the emergency supplemental in the rules that were passed last week, the opportunity was taken to clarify the amendments. I am not sure whether or not any formal apology was made; but I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that when the record is corrected, we have received a response that addresses the historical record of this body. So it serves no purpose to ask for an apology today. I do think we were a little bit off our mark, and I would hope that having not asked for an apology and having not received it and seeking only the straightforward clarification, that will be the approach that we will take. One, that we will be allowed to debate in this body, whether it be in committee or on the floor, and vigorously disagree, and that in that disagreement, there will be no punishment.

The only factor that we should have as the test of whether we are right or wrong or whether or not we prevail is that vote. And, in many instances, the majority, now in control of the House, the Senate, the Supreme Court, the executive, by one party, prevails. In the instance of the Committee on the Judiciary, in this occasion on these amendments, the majority prevailed.

The minority, however, felt passion about the amendments and, in fact, believes that they were right; and I personally believe that two amendments, one to do a study of the negative impact of this legislation, if it might occur, or what dangerous procedures might occur of this legislation, where would a child seek to go because they were fearful of getting parental consent, that was a sincere amendment to get important facts. And giving a child the opportunity to talk to godparents or aunts and uncles or cousins, clergy or grandparents was not sinister; it was simply to protect lives.

So I would hope that that would be where we would divide on our beliefs, our reasons for the legislation; not on how we talked about a bill. For there have been many legislative initiatives that have had vigorous talk, and Members have agreed and disagreed about the vigorous talk. But the only criteria for prevailing or not prevailing is that vote, not a characterization by someone else that you are the leader of exempting sexual predators. Saying it over and over again, of course, may cause some to cringe, and it is not my intent, Mr. Speaker, but I think clarification is very important.

And in the course of the battle of that particular legislation, you can be assured as it was being debated, if the glimpses of the words that were gotten were only that it was something to do with sexual predators, that just muddies the water of the good intentions that you might be having and the intent of what you wrote in that amendment.

It would almost be like those who are abhorring drug cartels and drug dealers, that if they were to have an amendment dealing with a GAO study, determining the extent of drug cartels’ influence in the United States or the growth of drug cartels between 1990 and 2005, and all of a sudden it was characterized as an amendment for the GAO to promote drug dealership and drug cartels, you would not want to hear that on the floor; but it certainly would be the complete opposite of your intent, and it would have mischaracterized the debate where you were standing and trying to determine whether some legislation promoted drug cartels more so than broke them up.

The Constitution allows us the opportunity for three branches of government, and I think that this country is unique because of it, very unique. In its uniqueness, we have checks and balances. The checks and balances do not purge into the inner workings of each body. So we are the holder of our own records. And it leaves little room sometimes in another body to go and complain about the workings of one specific body, particularly the words that are spoken.

□ 1815

And so there are no other grounds or no other opportunities to clear the air

other than to seek this personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the course of this discussion, it was not rendered in anger or anguish. It was simply rendered to say that what occurred deserved the greater attention of this body and that it was on the brink of abuse, and the sadness is that we had to rise to the floor more than once before it was ultimately corrected in the waning hours of last week's legislative session. Does that speak well of us? It does not. The Rules Committee is a place where we ferret out rules. Our respective committees is a place where we vigorously oversee legislation and provide our input and insight and our thought processes to do what is right. I would venture to say there has not been one committee hearing and markup where some Member promoted the criminal elements that would do harm to America. And if any thought came to the mind of a colleague that that was the intent of that Member, I would assure you that the best approach of that particular colleague would be to query that Member in that committee room. None of us were queried about the question of the intent of our amendments, whether or not they had to do with predators, child sexual predators, sexual predators. No one was queried. And therefore, the interpretation that was attributed to us was purposeful. And here on this floor, the same courtesy should be extended. And if you are misunderstood, if you misspeak, from the integrity again of this record that would be for all to see, someone should query you and give you the opportunity to correct your words, or in the alternative, when the height of the debate is so furious there is a challenge by someone at some point, that the words be called out.

There are a lot of papers here, Mr. Speaker, because I am looking at this debate that went on, and so I will not add to some of the accusations that were made in the debate going back and forth. I am simply going to conclude by asking, again, that it not ever be done again and asking that we respect the individual rights of Members to defend and represent their constituents and to offer vigorous debate, both consent and dissent, and as well the right to vigorously disagree on a legislative initiative. If we can hold to those tenets and the idea of the Constitution, which I hold very dear, which I will read briefly into the record, "the sacred rights of mankind", a statement by Alexander Hamilton, 1775, "are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam on the whole volume of human nature by the hand of the divinity itself and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power."

Of course, this is high language to talk about the rights bestowed upon mankind, humankind, that they are not found in paper. And this quote is correct.

But one thing is right as well, Mr. Speaker, is that although all is not said and done on the written word, it certainly is a parallel to our rights, because we look to a written document for our rights. We look to the written word. We look to the Madison papers to determine our rights. And therefore, the written word is extremely important.

We have had our say on this, and I hope that it has been a deliberate statement. We will do work in the Judiciary Committee in the coming days and weeks and months. We will have many opportunities to vigorously disagree.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, we have had many opportunities to agree. And I expect that we will find common ground throughout the days and weeks and months, Democrats and Republicans, around issues of importance to the Nation. But when we use this document to exercise our job and to debate vigorously and disagree, we should not be cited for what we have said about a bill, or punished because we have said something about a bill that others would not agree with.

Our final act will hopefully be one that is respectful of this House and of this place. To the Judiciary Committee Members as we gather on a daily basis, weekly basis, I believe they will all agree that we have the right to disagree and to debate vigorously in the committee, in the Rules Committee and on this floor.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I close by saying I hope never again, never again.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to raise a point of personal privilege under rule IX, clause 1 of the House Rules. This point, as did the point raised by my colleague on the Judiciary Committee from New York, Mr. NADLER, relates to the malreporting by the Republican Leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act of 2005.

While I appreciate the efforts of the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee for having filed a supplemental report (part 2 of House Report 109-51), I must raise this point of personal privilege nonetheless in order to emphasize the fact that the accuracy and the veracity of House committee reports carries tremendous weight and implications for the reputation, professional record, and personal life of Members of Congress.

Again, while the supplemental report to 109-51 makes some corrections to the mistakes made in Part 1, the report still contains an inaccurate representation of the amendments that I, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, offered in committee on April 13, 2005 in room 2141 of Rayburn. I offered two amendments en bloc that read as such:

Amendment No. 1, designated as DL-005,
Page 3, after line 2, insert the following:
"(3) The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles, or first cousins."

Amendment No. 2, designated as DL-006,
Add at the end the following:
SEC. 4. STUDY BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

The General Accounting Office shall conduct a study detailing the impact of the

number of unsafe and illegal abortions performed on minors who would be affected by this law, and report to Congress the results of that study within 1 year of the enactment of this Act.

Again, while I offered these amendments en bloc, they were separate and distinct amendments. The Supplemental Report, page 2 states that:

Ms. JACKSON LEE offered an amendment that would have exempted from the Act any clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles, or first cousins, and would require a study by the Government Accounting Office (emphasis added). This combination of the two distinct amendments give an inaccurate representation of the amendments that I offered during Committee and therefore, muddled the import of the very substantive amendment on which I joined my colleagues during our debate of the bill on the Floor on April 27, 2005.

I would like to cite the insightful and sagacious words of my colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules on April 27, 2005 on this matter:

There is no question that we can debate and disagree over the impact the bill can have. We can argue over the impact the bill can have. We can argue over how well it has been written or what language it should include to be more effective; but regardless of the way the debate turns out, the caption on the top of that bill or amendment serves to instruct the American people as to what the original intent of the legislation was.

It serves as an unbiased reading on what the amendment aims to accomplish. To falsify and rewrite that description as a political attack is not only unprecedented; it is fundamentally dishonest and an abuse of the power given to the majority by the American people and their votes.

As my colleague stated, the amendments "instruct the American people as to what the original intent . . . was." It took a resolution of privilege introduced by the Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, a point of personal privilege, and a wealth of time and debate before the Committee on Rules to move the leadership of the Committee on Rules to even tender an action to redress the problem. The lack of accuracy in the supplemental report just underscores and reiterates the initial mal-intent to commit a malfeasance.

Under rule IX, paragraph (1) of the House Rules, Mr. NADLER justifiably asserted his point because not only his but my "rights and reputation" have been offended by the conduct of the Chairman in publishing House Report 109-51. To reiterate, the language used in pages 45-49 patently malreported and maligned the authors of amendments to H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act of 2005.

On May 3, 2005, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary led debate on his resolution of privilege, H. Res. 253 that concerned the ways in which the act of the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee negatively affected the "rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings."

So too, was this resolution properly and justifiably introduced because, in that case, the privileges of "dignity" and "the integrity of [the House's] proceedings" have been patently violated. To purposefully misreport the good-faith amendments that have been offered by Members of this venerable House debases the nature and trustworthiness of the House Report.

After this debacle, Members will still have to scan committee reports with a fine-toothed comb—not for substantive value, but for accuracy and veracity of their reporting value. This is the diminution of the dignity of the process. This is the diminution of the integrity of the House.

The American people must be made aware that we, the authors of the amendments on pages 45–49 of House Report 109–51 do not associate ourselves with the misreported portions thereof.

House Report 109–51 not only improperly made negative inferences as to the import and intent of my amendments, and the supplemental report still combines two distinct and separately-offered amendments into one.

In terms of the personal privileges violated by the report, the misreporting—and the malreporting of the amendments offered by my colleagues Mr. SCOTT, Mr. NADLER, and me affected our rights, reputation and conduct. As founder and chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, a report that cites an amendment offered by me that would exempt sexual predators from liability is at the very least offensive.

My constituents and the constituents of my colleagues do read House Reports, and the nefarious language that the chairman avers as representative of his true intentions should be highlighted as contrary to the ideals on which this House, this Government, and this Nation were established.

[From the U.S. Fed News, Apr. 26, 2005]

HOUSE REPUBLICANS: ARROGANCE UNCHECKED

WASHINGTON, DC.—Rep. Louise M. Slaughter, D-NY (28th CD), issued the following statement:

Rep. Louise M. Slaughter (D-NY-28), Ranking Member of the House Committee on Rules, delivered the attached statement on the House Floor this morning regarding the gross abuse of power by Chairman James Sensenbrenner and the Majority on the Judiciary Committee this week.

Chairman Sensenbrenner and his staff rewrite the captions of five Democratic Amendments to distort their meaning and intent in the Judiciary Committee Report on H.R. 748. The goal of the distortion was to clearly suggest that the amendments were written to protect the rights of sexual predators, which is absolutely false.

Rep. Slaughter stated during her floor speech, “. . . to falsely rewrite the intent of an amendment submitted by another member, to intentionally distort its description as being designed to protect sexual predators, is no different than accusing a fellow member of Congress as being apologists for sexual predators themselves. That is in effect what the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee has done here . . .”

The “Sensenbrenner Standard” is a Clear Abuse of Power.

Chairman Sensenbrenner maintains that he was justified in changing the captions, because the language of the amendments did not expressly provide exceptions for grandmothers and grandfathers who also happen to be sexual predators. But the ridiculousness of this argument is easily apparent.

The amendments didn't have language that expressly included the possibility that the grandparents may be terrorists either, but that doesn't mean it is not still illegal to be a terrorist. In fact, there are an infinite number of possible exceptions that would have to be expressly addressed in every single amendment or bill offered if this new standard were properly utilized. This is called the “Sensenbrenner Standard.”

For example, the tax cuts which passed this last Congress do not include specific exceptions for sexual predators. If the “Sensenbrenner standard were properly applied, it should be renamed the “Sexual Predator Tax Relief Act”.

Likewise, the Small Business Bill of Rights, which the House is considering today, would be renamed the “Sexual Predator Bill of Rights,” as there are, no doubt, sexual predators who own small businesses in America which are not specifically excluded in this legislation.

“For Republicans to deem it their right to falsify and distort the work of other Members of Congress is the height of arrogance and another abuse of power,” states Congresswoman Slaughter. She added “The Sensenbrenner Standard is a dishonest and offensive Republican tactic that further damages the waning credibility of this government. Mr. Sensenbrenner and the Republican leadership of this body owe an apology to the Democratic Members of Congress whom they have maligned.”

The following amendments were offered and voted down by recorded votes in the Judiciary Committee markup of H.R. 748—The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA):

The following chart demonstrates how Judiciary Committee Republicans blatantly mischaracterized these amendments in their official committee report on the bill. This is in a public document containing the legislative history of this bill:

Description of Amendment: (1) A Nadler amendment allows an adult who could be prosecuted under the bill to go to a Federal district court and seek a waiver to the state's parental notice laws if this remedy is not available in the state court. (no 11–16)

Amendment description in House Report 109–51: Roll Call No. 1. Mr. Nadler offered an amendment that would have created an additional layer of Federal court review that could be used by sexual predators to escape conviction under the bill. By a roll call vote of 11 yeas to 16 nays, the amendment was defeated.

Description of amendment: (2) A Nadler amendment to exempt a grandparent or adult sibling from the criminal and civil provisions in the bill (no 12–19)

Amendment description in House Report 109–51: Roll Call No.2. Mr. Nadler offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution under the bill if they were grandparents or adult siblings of a minor. By a roll call vote of 12 yeas to 19 nays, the amendment was defeated.

Description of amendment: (3) A Scott amendment to exempt cab drivers, bus drivers and others in the business transportation profession from the criminal provisions in the bill (no 13–17)

Amendment description in House Report 109–51: Roll Call No.3. Mr. Scott offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution if they are taxicab drivers, bus drivers, or others in the business of professional transport. By a roll call vote of 13 yeas to 17 nays, the amendment was defeated.

Description of amendment: (4) A Scott amendment that would have limited criminal liability to the person committing the offense in the first degree (no 12–18)

Amendment description in House Report 109–51: Roll Call No.4. Mr. Scott offered an amendment that would have exempted from prosecution under the bill those who aid and abet criminals who could be prosecuted under the bill. By a roll call vote of 12 yeas to 18 nays, the amendment was defeated.

Description of amendment: (5) A Jackson-Lee amendment to exempt clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles or first cousins from the penalties in the bill (no 13–20)

Amendment description in House Report 109–51: Roll Call No. 5. Ms. Jackson-Lee offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution under the bill if they were clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles, or first cousins of a minor, and would require a study by the Government Accounting Office. By a roll call vote of 13 yeas to 20 nays, the amendment was defeated.

Text of Rep. Slaughter's Floor Speech:

“. . . but I want to talk for a minute about another abuse which has occurred in this chamber, a personal affront to three of our colleagues I have never witnessed in my near twenty years serving in this House.

The Rules Committee discovered yesterday that the Judiciary Committee Report on this very bill, which was authored by the Majority Staff, contained amendment summaries which had been rewritten by committee staff for the sole purpose of distorting the original intent of the authors.

This Committee Report took liberty to mischaracterize and even falsify the intent of several amendments offered in Committee by Democratic Members of this body.

At least five amendments to this bill, which were designed to protect the rights of family members and innocent bystanders from prosecution under this bill, were rewritten as amendments designed to protect sexual predators from prosecution and were then included in the committee report as if that was the original intent of the authors.

The thing is, sexual predators were not mentioned anywhere in any of these amendments.

These amendments were no more about sexual predators than they were about terrorists or arsonists or any other criminal class in our society. These amendments were about the rights of grandmothers and siblings and clergy and innocent bystanders.

I asked the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee about this deception yesterday afternoon at the Rules Committee hearing.

And instead of decrying what I certainly expected would be revealed as a mistake by an overzealous staffer . . . The Chairman stood by those altered amendment descriptions. He made very clear to the Rules Committee that the alterations to these members' amendments were deliberate.

When pressed as to why his committee staff took such an unprecedented action, the Chairman immediately offered up his own anger over the manner in which Democrats had chosen to debate and oppose this unfortunate piece of legislation we have before us today.

In fact . . . He said, and I quote . . . “You don't like what we wrote about your amendments, and we don't like what you said about our bill.”

To falsely rewrite the intent of an amendment submitted by another member, to intentionally distort its description as being designed to protect sexual predators, is no different than accusing a fellow member of Congress as being an apologist for sexual predators themselves.

That is in effect what the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee has done here, with all deliberation.

And he has ensured that these amendment descriptions will be encapsulated in the record for all time by including those unfair and incorrect amendment summaries in the Committee report.

This is a new low for this chamber Mr. Speaker.

This is a clearly dishonest, unethical attack on the credibility and character of another member. And sadly, it is just the latest in a pattern of unethical and abusive tactics employed by this Majority.

How incredibly arrogant is this majority . . . that they believe they have

the right to tamper with official congressional documents for their own political purposes?

How unbelievably arrogant is the leadership of this Congress . . . that they would force their own politicized interpretation of another member's work upon this body and upon the American people, in an official committee report?

The Majority's actions are not only an affront to all members of this house, but they are also an affront to the American people.

There is no question that we can debate and disagree over the impact a bill will have.

We can argue over how well it has been written or what language it should include to be more effective. But regardless of how that debate turns out, the caption on the top of that bill or amendment serves to instruct the American people as to what original intent of that legislation was.

It serves as an unbiased reading on what that amendment aims to accomplish.

To falsify and rewrite that description as a political attack, is not only unprecedented, it is fundamentally dishonest and it is an abuse of the power given to the Majority by the American people.

And I have no doubts Mr. Speaker, no doubts, that unless the Congressional Record is amended to reflect the true captions of these amendments, then we will surely see these erroneous captions again in the form of campaign attack mail pieces.

In fact, when we pressed last night in the Rules Committee to have the record amended to reflect the honest and accurate captions that belong on those amendments, we were defeated on a party line vote.

So now, these honorable and hardworking Members of Congress will be forever branded in the official record as having offered amendments which were designed to protect

sexual predators, when nothing, nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I have often heard the Chairman of the Rules Committee as well as other Republicans talk about the loss of civility in this chamber.

But perhaps they will be the last to realize, that in order to regain some of that lost civility, they need look no further than their own abusive, unethical and arrogant administration of this House of Representatives.'

The following amendments were offered and voted down by recorded votes in the Judiciary Committee markup of H.R. 748—The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA):

The Judiciary Committee Republicans blatantly mischaracterized these amendments in their official committee report on the bill. This is in a public document containing the legislative history of this bill.

Description of amendment	Amendment description in House Report 109-51
(1) a Nadler amendment allows an adult who could be prosecuted under the bill to go to a Federal district court and seek a waiver to the state's parental notice laws if this remedy is not available in the state court (no 11-16).	Rollcall No. 1. Mr. Nadler offered an amendment that would have created an additional layer of Federal court review that could be used by sexual predators to escape conviction under the bill. By a rollcall vote of 11 yeas to 16 nays, the amendment was defeated.
(2) a Nadler amendment to exempt a grandparent or adult sibling from the criminal and civil provisions in the bill (no 12-19).	Rollcall No. 2. Mr. Nadler offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution under the bill if they were grandparents or adult siblings of a minor. By a rollcall vote of 12 yeas to 19 nays, the amendment was defeated.
(3) a Scott amendment to exempt cab drivers, bus drivers and others in the business transportation profession from the criminal provisions in the bill (no 13-17).	Rollcall No. 3. Mr. Scott offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution if they are taxicab drivers, bus drivers, or others in the business of professional transport. By a rollcall vote of 13 yeas to 17 nays, the amendment was defeated.
(4) a Scott amendment that would have limited criminal liability to the person committing the offense in the first degree (no 12-18).	Rollcall No. 4. Mr. Scott offered an amendment that would have exempted from prosecution under the bill those who aid and abet criminals who could be prosecuted under the bill. By a rollcall vote of 12 yeas to 18 nays, the amendment was defeated.
(5) a Jackson-Lee amendment to exempt clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles or first cousins from the penalties in the bill (no 13-20).	Rollcall No. 5. Ms. Jackson-Lee offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution under the bill if they were clergy, godparents, aunts, uncles, or first cousins of a minor, and would require a study by the Government Accountability Office. By a rollcall vote of 13 yeas to 20 nays, the amendment was defeated.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for her courage in bringing this personal privilege before the House.

The very fact that this Member has been mistreated should cause all of us deep concern. It is wrong and unacceptable.

The fact that a report is being supplemented by the Chairman with significant and startling changes attests to the fact that the Majority knew that the original report was wrongly and inappropriately filed. But that does not resolve the matter—an apology is owed to Ms. JACKSON-LEE by the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

I know that the distinguished Chairman, for whom I have great respect, would like to call it a drafting dispute or return to a discussion on the merits of the bill.

In fact, I would think that the Chairman of the Judiciary would be sensitive to the treatment of committee reports and would share my view that committee reports should not be misused to hurt a Member, given that the distinguished Chairman was the cosponsor of a resolution in 1983 regarding the alteration of committee reports, a matter of seriousness that was ultimately investigated by the Ethics Committee.

This issue is about fundamental respect for our democracy, for the dignity of the House, and for the integrity of the proceedings of this body. It is about how we treat each other, and it is about trust and the betrayal of that trust.

The bounds of trust that we need to function in this Body are weakened even further by this sorry and disgusting chapter. What the leadership of the Committee on the Judiciary did is just another extension of the abuse of power of the Republican majority in both Chambers of the Congress of the United States.

What they are doing with the filibuster in the other body is to try to silence the Minority and

break the rules. They are using any means to justify their partisan agenda to the far right, even if it violates the rules, the Constitution, and fundamental decency and trust.

Here in the House, there is an attempt to disregard the rules that protect us all, corrupt the integrity of our proceedings, and demean not only the dignity of this House, but going so far as to demean individual Members.

There is an attempt to limit the voice of the Minority, reducing the opportunity for Members to speak on the floor, and offer substitutes and amendments.

Comity and trust between the Majority and the Minority are essential and must be encouraged. That is why the Republican Leadership has an obligation to come here right now on the floor and disavow this disgraceful behavior.

There is no need for this kind of misbehavior and abuse by the Majority. We should follow the rules of this House and treat each other with the proper respect.

To preserve the trust that the American people place in us, the Republican leadership in this House must pledge that this travesty will never happen again.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my question of personal privilege today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H. Res. 193, by the yeas and nays;
- H. Res. 142, by the yeas and nays.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF THE HISTORIC MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY TO PROMOTE THE CIVIL SOCIETY IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 193.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 193, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 22, answered “present” 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]
YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Bachus	Bass
Ackerman	Baird	Bean
Aderholt	Baker	Beauprez
Akin	Baldwin	Becerra
Alexander	Barrett (SC)	Berman
Allen	Barrow	Berry
Andrews	Bartlett (MD)	Biggert
Baca	Barton (TX)	Blirakis

Bishop (GA) Filner
 Bishop (NY) Fitzpatrick (PA)
 Bishop (UT) Flake
 Blackburn Foley
 Blumenauer Forbes
 Blunt Ford
 Boehlert Fortenberry
 Boehner Fossella
 Bonilla Foxx
 Bonner Frank (MA)
 Bono Franks (AZ)
 Boozman Frelinghuysen
 Boren Gallegly
 Boswell Garrett (NJ)
 Boucher Gerlach
 Boustany Gibbons
 Boyd Gilchrist
 Bradley (NH) Gillmor
 Brady (PA) Gingrey
 Brady (TX) Gohmert
 Brown (OH) Gonzalez
 Brown (SC) Goode
 Brown, Corrine Goodlatte
 Brown-Waite, Gordon
 Ginny Granger
 Burgess Graves
 Burton (IN) Green (WI)
 Butterfield Green, Al
 Buyer Green, Gene
 Calvert Grijalva
 Camp Gutknecht
 Cannon Hall
 Cantor Harman
 Capito Harris
 Capps Hart
 Capuano Hastings (WA)
 Cardin Hayes
 Cardoza Hayworth
 Carnahan Hefley
 Carson Hensarling
 Carter Herger
 Case Herseth
 Castle Higgins
 Chabot Hinojosa
 Chandler Hobson
 Chocola Hoekstra
 Clay Holden
 Cleaver Holt
 Clyburn Honda
 Coble Hooley
 Cole (OK) Hostettler
 Conaway Hoyer
 Cooper Hunter
 Costa Hyde
 Cox Inglis (SC)
 Cramer Inslee
 Crenshaw Israel
 Crowley Issa
 Cubin Istook
 Cuellar Jackson (IL)
 Culberson Jackson-Lee
 Cummings (TX)
 Cunningham Jefferson
 Davis (AL) Jenkins
 Davis (CA) Jindal
 Davis (FL) Johnson (CT)
 Davis (IL) Johnson (IL)
 Davis (KY) Johnson, E. B.
 Davis (TN) Johnson, Sam
 Davis, Jo Ann Jones (NC)
 Davis, Tom Kanjorski
 Deal (GA) Kaptur
 DeFazio Kelly
 DeGette Kennedy (MN)
 Delahunt Kennedy (RI)
 DeLauro Kildee
 DeLay Kind
 Dent King (IA)
 Diaz-Balart, L. King (NY)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kingston
 Dicks Kirk
 Doggett Kline
 Doolittle Knollenberg
 Doyle Kolbe
 Drake Kuhl (NY)
 Dreier LaHood
 Duncan Langevin
 Edwards Larsen (WA)
 Ehlers Latham
 Emanuel LaTourrette
 Emerson Leach
 Engel Levin
 English (PA) Lewis (CA)
 Eshoo Lewis (GA)
 Etheridge Lewis (KY)
 Evans Linder
 Everett Lipinski
 Fattah LoBiondo
 Feeney Lofgren, Zoe

Lowey
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Maloney
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McCreery
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMorris
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Melancon
 Menendez
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nunes
 Nussle
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pallone
 Pascarell
 Pastor
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Pence
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Price (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)

Ryun (KS) Smith (TX)
 Sabo Smith (WA)
 Salazar Snyder
 Sanchez, Linda Sodrel
 T. Solis
 Sanchez, Loretta Souder
 Saxton Spratt
 Schakowsky Stearns
 Schwartz (PA) Strickland
 Schwarz (MI) Stupak
 Scott (GA) Sullivan
 Scott (VA) Sweeney
 Sensenbrenner Tancredo
 Sessions Tanner
 Shadegg Tauscher
 Shaw Taylor (MS)
 Shays Taylor (NC)
 Sherman Terry
 Sherwood Thomas
 Shimkus Thompson (CA)
 Shuster Thompson (MS)
 Simmons Thornberry
 Simpson Tiaht
 Skelton Tiberi
 Slaughter Turner
 Smith (NJ) Udall (CO)

Upton
 Van Hollen
 Viscosky
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wolf
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NAYS—22

Stark
 Towns
 Udall (NM)
 Velazquez
 Waters
 Woolsey

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Moore (WI)

NOT VOTING—18

Berkley
 Costello
 Dingell
 Ferguson
 Gutierrez
 Hastings (FL)
 Hulshof

Keller
 Lantos
 Larson (CT)
 Millender
 McDonald
 Musgrave
 Otter

□ 1851

Ms. LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. UDALL
 New Mexico and Mrs. JONES of Ohio
 changed their vote from "yea" to
 "nay."

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed her vote
 from "nay" to "yea."

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin changed
 her vote from "yea" to "present."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor
 thereof) the rules were suspended and
 the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
 the table.

SUPPORTING GOALS AND IDEALS
 OF A ROTARY INTERNATIONAL
 DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
 PEARCE). The pending business is the
 question of suspending the rules and
 agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 142.

The Clerk read the title of the resolu-
 tion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 question is on the motion offered by
 the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms.
 ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend
 the rules and agree to the resolution,
 H. Res. 142, on which the yeas and nays
 are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0,
 not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]
 YEAS—413

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Allen
 Andrews
 Baca
 Baird
 Baker
 Baldwin
 Barrett (SC)
 Barrow
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Bass
 Bean
 Beauprez
 Becerra
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd
 Bradley (NH)
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carson
 Carter
 Case
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Chocola
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Cooper
 Costa
 Cox
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cubin
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis (TN)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 English (PA)
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Everett
 Fattah
 Feeney

DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 DeLay
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Doggett
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 English (PA)
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Everett
 Fattah
 Feeney

Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kennedy (TX)
 Kennedy (NY)
 Kennedy (IL)
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick (MI)
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Latham
 LaTourrette
 Leach
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lofgren, Zoe

Owens	Rush	Tanner
Oxley	Ryan (OH)	Tauscher
Pallone	Ryan (WI)	Taylor (MS)
Pascarell	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (NC)
Pastor	Sabo	Terry
Paul	Salazar	Thomas
Payne	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Pearce	T.	Thompson (MS)
Pelosi	Sanchez, Loretta	Thornberry
Pence	Saxton	Tiahrt
Peterson (MN)	Schakowsky	Tiberi
Peterson (PA)	Schwartz (PA)	Towns
Petri	Schwarz (MI)	Turner
Pickering	Scott (GA)	Udall (CO)
Pitts	Scott (VA)	Udall (NM)
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Serrano
Poe	Sessions	Upton
Pombo	Shadegg	Van Hollen
Pomeroy	Shaw	Velázquez
Porter	Shays	Visclosky
Price (GA)	Sherman	Walden (OR)
Price (NC)	Sherwood	Walsh
Pryce (OH)	Shimkus	Wamp
Putnam	Shuster	Wasserman
Radanovich	Simmons	Schultz
Rahall	Simpson	Waters
Ramstad	Skelton	Watson
Rangel	Slaughter	Watt
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Reichert	Smith (WA)	Weldon (PA)
Renzi	Snyder	Weller
Reyes	Sodrel	Westmoreland
Reynolds	Solis	Wexler
Rogers (AL)	Souder	Whitfield
Rogers (KY)	Spratt	Wicker
Rogers (MI)	Stark	Wilson (NM)
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland	Woolsey
Ross	Stupak	Wu
Rothman	Sullivan	Wynn
Roybal-Allard	Sweeney	Young (AK)
Royce	Tancredo	Young (FL)
Ruppersberger		

NOT VOTING—20

Bachus	Harris	Musgrave
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Otter
Conyers	Hulshof	Sanders
Dingell	Lantos	Schiff
Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)	Tierney
Gilchrest	Millender-	Weiner
Gutierrez	McDonald	Wilson (SC)

□ 1909

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Tuesday, May 10, 2005, to vote on roll-call vote Nos. 162 and 163 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "Yea" on rollcall vote No. 162 on H. Res. 193—expressing support to the organizers and participants of the historic meeting of the Assembly to Promote the Civil Society in Cuba on May 20, 2005, in Havana; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 163 on H. Res. 142—supporting the goals and ideals of a "Rotary International Day" and celebrating and honoring Rotary International on the occasion of its centennial anniversary.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House,

the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday's New York Times revealed that since the expiration of the Federal ban on assault weapons there have been no real boom in sales of the weapons at American gun stores. Opponents of the ban seized the opportunity to say the ban was ineffective. However, I think these statistics prove that assault weapons have absolutely no practical purpose except to kill human beings.

Many Members of the House have told me the assault weapons ban is an affront on our second amendment rights, but the public never saw the assault weapons ban as an infringement on their second amendment rights. Last September, a Dallas newspaper ran a poll indicating that 78 percent of Texas gun owners supported keeping the ban in place. And nobody takes their second amendment rights more seriously than Texas gun owners. So nobody should be surprised that the sales of these weapons are so low.

However, some people are buying these weapons. They may intend to use these guns in crimes; and because of our pre-9/11 gun laws, these people could possibly be aligned with our enemies in the war on terror. It is time for this Congress to finally be proactive when it comes to gun safety and gun laws. We cannot wait for another Columbine before we address how easy it is for criminals and terrorists to legally purchase these hand-held weapons of mass destruction.

We need commonsense gun laws that allow law-abiding citizens to purchase guns for sport and self-defense, but ensure that those criminals with felonies and terrorist backgrounds cannot arm themselves. We need a new stronger assault weapons ban.

One of the things that I certainly will be working for is the large-capacity clips.

□ 1915

There are many that will say, Well, it doesn't matter how many clips you have. But if you see what these clips can do, especially against our police officers, it is something that we should not allow, certainly in this country. The only ones that should be allowed to own them are our police officers and certainly our military.

Resourceful criminals still found a way to obtain illegal weapons. However, the ban made these weapons more expensive. And because they became more expensive, we saw that gangs were not buying these guns. I think that is one of the reasons why it worked.

Tomorrow we are going to be voting on an anti-gang bill. We see our police

officers on the front line against these gangs all the time. During the 10 years that the ban was in place, crimes involving banned weapons dropped by 60 percent, so we do know that it was working. Nearly every police organization in this country supported the assault weapons ban and wants to make sure that we try and get it in place again. When the men and women on the front lines in the war on gangs and crime in this country say they want assault weapons banned, we should listen.

This week we are celebrating or mourning those police officers that were killed in this last past year. Every year it seems that the numbers are growing. We should be doing more to protect our police officers that try to protect us on a daily basis. However, we need to improve on the shortfalls of the old ban, namely, magazines as I have mentioned that hold more than 10 rounds.

Personally, I remember going back to 1993 when there was a shooting on the Long Island Railroad and my husband was one of those killed. The person that was doing the shooting had clips of 15 and more bullets. Every one of those bullets made its mark, killing a number of people and injuring many, my husband dying and my son certainly being injured. If we had a clip that was only 10, 15 people might not have been injured or killed. I think that is important.

The only Americans who should be allowed to have these weapons are soldiers and police officers, as I have said. Using one of these weapons with these clips in your home would certainly take down an intruder, but the bullets are flying. Come on, let us use some common sense. They would be flying all over the place. You could be hitting your neighbor. Why do we need clips that are more than 10? As I said, our police officers should have them, but it will probably be when we see these gangs buying the large capacity clips, that is when we will have outrage here.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop listening to the NRA's rhetoric and start listening to common sense. We should be working together. The whole idea is to make sure that people are safe. No legislation that anyone is trying to do that I am aware of is taking away the right of someone to own a gun. We certainly should make it harder for those criminals, those terrorists that are out there at gun shows buying guns, criminals and gangs buying guns illegally. We can do a better job.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in the next several weeks that we will see legislation come down. I certainly will work on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

HONORING THE PASSING OF
RAFAEL DIAZ-BALART

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and many fond memories that I stand here today to honor the life and invaluable legacy of Dr. Rafael Diaz-Balart. As a prominent attorney and elected official in his native land of Cuba, Rafael quickly rose to the position of majority leader in the Cuban Republic's House of Representatives before Fidel Castro illegally seized power in the 1959 Communist revolution.

As majority leader, Rafael warned his legislative colleagues of Castro's desire of absolute power, a desire that would be achieved by any means necessary. In a prophetic speech, Rafael said in the legislature of Castro's thugs, "They do not want peace. They do not want a national solution. They do not want democracy or elections or fraternity. Fidel Castro and his group seek only one thing, power, and total power at that. And they want to achieve that power through violence, so that their total power will enable them to destroy every vestige of the constitution and law in Cuba, to institute the most cruel, most barbaric tyranny, a tyranny that would teach the people the true meaning of tyranny."

How sadly correct Rafael Diaz-Balart was so many years ago. Vigilantly opposed to the Communist tyranny and oppression that had taken hold of his country, Dr. Diaz-Balart and his family fled the island. Shortly after leaving Cuba, he founded the White Rose Party, an organization dedicated to fighting against Castro's dictatorial regime and restoring democracy and liberty in Cuba. In addition, his testimony to the United States Senate in 1960 alerted the Nation to the dangers of Castro's government. In his testimony, Rafael provided evidence of Castro's oppression and his abuse of the political dissidents as well as the global threat of communism.

He, like my father Enrique Ros and so many others who fled Cuba due to Castro's dictatorial regime in these four decades, dreamed of a free Cuba, a country where human rights would once again be respected, where political prisoners would be freed, where a democratic multiparty political system would flourish and a free market economy would thrive, thus allowing the Cuban people and their foreign economic partners to own their own businesses and to prosper.

A passionate and dedicated leader, Rafael was a relentless defender of human rights. He along with so many other human rights activists brought Cuba's ongoing human rights violations to the attention of the United States Government, to the attention of the American people and, indeed, to the international community. In addition, Rafael demonstrated his ability to fight not only for the Cuban and the Cuban-American community but for all oppressed people throughout the world. His determination and his resoluteness have guided me in my own career as a public servant from my beginnings in the Florida State legislature to my current position in the United States Congress. I was inspired by his endless commitment to the Cuban people and to all individuals living under dictatorial rule.

His sons Rafael, Jose, Lincoln and Mario continue this legacy of promoting peace, liberty and the rule of law, a legacy that began with Rafael Diaz-Balart, Sr., the namesake of Florida International University's college of law. Perhaps Rafael's strongest political legacy is the one that he has passed on to his children and to his grandchildren, especially his sons Jose and Rafael and our esteemed colleagues serving with us in the U.S. House of Representatives, Congressmen LINCOLN and MARIO DIAZ-BALART.

I am privileged to have known and to have worked closely with Rafael and the Diaz-Balart family throughout my professional career as a legislator. Together with them, I will continue to promote a free and democratic Cuba and democracy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Dr. Rafael Diaz-Balart, who was a wonderful friend, a loving husband, a dedicated father and one of the most outstanding members of our Florida community. My thoughts and my prayers go out to his family during this difficult time. He will be sorely missed by all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LOBBYING REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months and days, a constant stream of headlines has opened the public's eye to the relationship between lawmakers and lobbyists and what goes on in this town and how we make our laws. Professional lobbyists have become a virtual "back office" for Congress and Congressmen, serve as travel agents, employment agencies and authors of legislation. In the past 6 years, lobbying expenditures have more than doubled to \$3 billion annually, nearly twice as much as we spend on campaigns. That is what they spend trying to influence the type of legislation we have. Whether it is on pharmaceutical legislation, prescription drugs, whether it is on the tax legislation, whether it is on energy legislation, the amount spent by lobbyists has doubled trying to influence the Members of Congress.

Yet while the number of professional lobbyists and their fees have increased, only one in five lobbyists required to register actually does. Of the 250 top lobbying firms, 210 have failed to file one or more of the necessary documents. The bottom line is that the special interests benefit from weak reporting, nonexistent oversight and toothless penalties while the credibility of the United States Congress, this entire institution and the Members who serve in it, suffers.

We have had in the past debates about campaign finance reform and proper debates about the relationship between donors and congressional candidates. It is time now to have a debate and pass legislation about the relationship between professional lobbyists and Members of Congress. The last major lobbying reforms were over 10 years ago. It is time to update our laws to reflect the explosive growth and increasing influence of professional lobbyists on this institution, the people's House.

For all those reasons, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and I have introduced the Lobbying and Ethics Reform Act. Our bill creates a code of official conduct for Congress. This code of conduct would close the revolving door by requiring former Members and staff to wait 2 years before coming back to lobby the institution they had worked at prior. The bill also ends the practice of lobbyists serving as congressional travel agents by arranging lavish junkets for Members. Our bill would require congressional travel to conform to expense guidelines similar to those of other government employees, so it is actually the work that trip is intended to do and work on that trip rather than it becoming a lavish vacation and a working trip in name only. We also require lobbyists to disclose their past connections, previous Hill employers and financial activities on a public database.

The Meehan-Emanuel bill increases the penalties for failing to comply with the Lobbying Disclosure Act. It also

creates a bipartisan House task force to recommend ways to reinvigorate ethics oversight and enforcement. It would require the Government Accountability Office to report twice a year on the state of oversight and enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, the gavel of this institution when it comes down should mark the opening of the people's House, not the auction house. Unless we reform the relationship between lobbyists and Members of Congress, we cannot restore the public's faith in the people's House. We are suffering from a systematic problem requiring an institutional solution.

Legislation here that we produced in the last Congress, the pharmaceutical industry spent \$154 million lobbying Members of Congress. When we were working on the reimportation legislation of pharmaceutical products, there were two lobbyists for every Member of Congress. The prescription drug bill was passed in a year in which lobbyists for the pharmaceutical industry was one of the biggest spenders on lobbying Members of Congress ended up resulting in an additional \$150 billion of profits for the pharmaceutical industry over a 10-year period of time.

Just the other day, we voted, this Congress, on an energy bill, a badly needed bill that did not deal with gas prices at the pump and yet gave tax credits, the public's tax money, to the wealthiest corporations who are making the biggest profits. Even the President acknowledged that it was wrong. Why? Because this institution is being lobbied by members that have the right to have their voices heard but not the right to have their voices literally drowning out the public's voice and individuals who vote for us.

It is time for this institution and the Members of Congress of both parties to come together, change the way professional lobbyists relate to Members of Congress, how they relate to the institution, whether there is a revolving door that goes from here, you go to a place of employment and whether you have in fact the transparency and the disclosure that is required, because in truth this is the whole cloud that exists, exists over all the institution. It requires all of us to work on dealing with this.

Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to ensure that the voices of the American people are not drowned out by the voices of the professional lobbyists working the halls of Congress. Only through lobbying reform can we restore the integrity of the Congress and retain the people's trust. We work on important issues here but not so important that it must literally push out the other voices. There is time and again, whether it is dealing with the pharmaceutical industry, the corporate tax bill, the energy bill, other pieces of legislation, you can mark literally the amount of money spent by the lobbying community and the type of legislation this institution passes.

When that gavel goes down, it is intended to open the people's House, not the auction house.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF LIEUTENANT PANTANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed at length how, a year ago in Iraq, a Marine second lieutenant, Ilario Pantano, made a split-second battlefield decision to shoot two Iraqi insurgents who refused to follow his orders to stop their movement towards him.

Two and a half months later a sergeant under his command, who never even saw the shooting and who was earlier demoted by Pantano for his lack of leadership abilities, accused him of murder. Now Lieutenant Pantano is facing a possible court-martial for two premeditated murders, a charge that can be punished by death.

Two weeks ago, the Marines held an article 32 hearing on the case. Now the hearing officer has received an extension until Friday to determine his recommendation about whether this should move forward to a court-martial.

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight, as I have many other nights, in support of Lieutenant Pantano. I have always maintained the innocence of Lieutenant Pantano, and I believe the hearing produced information that should conclusively prove his innocence.

During the hearing, it became clear that Sergeant Coburn, who accused Lieutenant Pantano of these actions, was not a credible witness. This sergeant has been demoted for his lack of leadership; and even while testifying, he was forced to admit that he recently disobeyed orders about publicly discussing this case. News reports from hearings recounted that during his testimony, Sergeant Coburn said "I don't know" or "I can't remember" over 50

times. It is inconceivable to me that these charges can move forward when the primary witness is someone who did not actually see the shooting and whose testimony was riddled with contradictory statements.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from so many people across this Nation who want this Marine exonerated. Like me, they believe he should never have been charged in the first place.

I have the utmost confidence and faith in the United States Marine Corps that in the next few days they will do what is the right thing by correcting this mistake and dismissing all charges against Lieutenant Pantano. I fear that if Lieutenant Pantano faces a court-martial for his actions, there may come a time when some other Marine, soldier, sailor, or airman will pause to second guess his or her decision and those few seconds may mean the difference between life and death for them.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot send the wrong message to our men and women in uniform. To instill doubt into the minds of our Nation's defenders places their lives and the security of our Nation in jeopardy.

I certainly hope that the Article 32 proceedings will finally bring out the truth in this case and bring closure to Lieutenant Pantano's family so that they may move forward with their lives.

By all accounts Lieutenant Pantano was an exceptional Marine. During the Article 32 hearing, many of those who served under him testified to his leadership ability and their sense of comfort and safety under his command. I pray that this week the hearing officer will recommend dismissal of all charges so that Marines can welcome back one of their finest officers and so Lieutenant Pantano may return to the Corps he loves so much.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to ask my colleagues to research this case and consider supporting House Resolution 167, my resolution to support Lieutenant Pantano as he faces this battle. And I encourage all of the Members to also visit his mother's Web site at www.defendthedefenders.org. I repeat: www.defendthedefenders.org, and learn more about this fine young Marine. I would be proud to call him my son or son-in-law.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by asking God to please bless the Pantano family and ask God to please bless all of our men and women in uniform and their families. And I ask God to please continue to bless America.

ABU GHRAIB SCANDAL: WHERE DOES THE BUCK STOP?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss a vital issue that has

not received nearly as much attention as it should, and that is the full accountability of those responsible for the prison abuse at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and likely other abuses in other locations.

Last week, 1 year after the shocking pictures of prisoner abuse became public, a military judge declared a mistrial in the case against Private First Class Lynndie England, and I emphasize private first class.

England, one of just a few enlisted personnel charged in the case, attempted to plead guilty in order to receive a more lenient sentence. But Judge James Pohl threw her guilty plea out and the court-martial after determining that Private England could not have realized her actions were wrong. Maybe that is because exactly 1 year ago today, Private England told the media that she was ordered by her superiors to pose naked with Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib prison.

The case has more questions about Abu Ghraib than it answers, Mr. Speaker. Who was really in charge at Abu Ghraib prison? Who ordered the torture, abuse, humiliation of those prisoners? Why have only a few enlisted personnel, and very low-ranking ones at that, and one Reservist officer been punished? What was the real chain of command? Were contractors involved at any point? And how did their involvement compromise the normal chain of command?

According to the Christian Science Monitor, a study by the Army Inspector General, not yet released but reported last week by the media, has exonerated all senior Army officers in Iraq and elsewhere. How about that? Exonerated them all, except the single brigadier general in charge of U.S. prison facilities in Iraq. Why does the Pentagon refuse to look up the chain of command, only trying to place blame at those at the very bottom? Does anyone really believe that these soldiers acted on their own?

The Philadelphia Inquirer editorialized: "No one at the top . . . is blamed for wrongdoing," even though the "climate was fostered from the top down that tolerated, even encouraged, the abuse at Abu Ghraib."

In February, 2004, the International Red Cross released a report detailing dozens of serious human rights violations that occurred in Iraq between just March and November of 2003, including electrocution, forced nudity, and other lewd sex acts, forcing detainees to wear hoods and more.

Who should be held accountable? First, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. He is at the top of my list. Personally authorized similar abusive interrogation techniques for prisoners held in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, including the use of dogs for intimidation, the removal of clothing, the hooding of prisoners, and "noninjurious physical contact." He ordered several prisoners in Iraq, though not at Abu Ghraib, to be hidden from the International Red

Cross so the organization could not monitor their treatment. Are we supposed to believe that such actions at Abu Ghraib were a mere coincidence and not orchestrated by anyone who had the power to order from the top down?

How about Lieutenant General Ricardo Sanchez? He is second on my list. Two Army investigations, one of which he stated he "failed to ensure proper staff oversight" of Abu Ghraib, but he has yet to be officially sanctioned, punished, or charged.

Third, Major General Geoffrey Miller. According to the Center for American Progress, he was sent to Abu Ghraib to "Gitmoize" the place. Under his command, the International Committee of the Red Cross found interrogation techniques at Guantanamo "tantamount to torture."

Fourth, White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales. When he served in that capacity, he advised President Bush that laws prohibiting torture do "not apply to the President's detention and interrogation of enemy combatants" and an interrogation tactic only constituted torture if it resulted in death, organ failure, or serious impairment of bodily functions.

And last, but surely not least, President George Bush. The President is not last on this list for no reason. Harry Truman proudly proclaimed "The buck stops here." It would seem this Commander in Chief believes the buck stops far before the Pentagon, White House, or Oval Office.

Mr. Speaker, why is Congress receiving more information on these atrocities from the news media than the President or the Department of Defense? It is because they are a part of the culture of abuse that starts with loose slogans like "Bring 'em on." It sends that signal down the chain of command. They were not only operating in an atmosphere created, fostered, and encouraged by top echelon officials at the White House. They were propelled by that very behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I include my remaining remarks in the RECORD.

This Congress ought to ask for the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a vital issue that has not received nearly as much attention as it should—the full accountability of those responsible for the prison abuse scandal at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and likely other abuses at other locations.

Last week, 1 year after the shocking pictures of prisoner abuse became public, a Military Judge declared a mistrial in the case against Private First Class Lynndie England.

England, one of just a few enlisted personnel charged in the case, attempted to plead guilty in order to receive a more lenient sentence, Judge James Pohl, a Colonel, however threw out her guilty plea and the court martial after determining that Pvt. England could not have realized her actions were wrong.

Maybe that is because exactly 1 year ago today Pvt. England told the media that she was ordered by her superiors to pose naked with Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib prison.

This case raises more questions about Abu Ghraib than it answers, Mr. Speaker.

Who was really in charge at Abu Ghraib prison? Who ordered the torture abuse/humiliation of these prisoners? Why have only a few enlisted personnel and one Reservist officer been punished? What was the chain of command? Were contractors involved and did their involvement skirt the normal chain of command?

According to the Christian Science Monitor, "for punishment, the military has issued either criminal or administrative charges against 125 soldiers and officers related to 350 cases in Iraq and Afghanistan. It's a different story with senior military officers, however. A study by the Army inspector general—not yet released but reported last week by the media—has exonerated all senior Army officers in Iraq and elsewhere except the brigadier general in charge of US prison facilities in Iraq."

Why does the Pentagon refuse to look up the chain of command to thoroughly investigate and charge high-level military and administration officials, instead focusing efforts on low-ranking enlisted personnel?

Does anyone believe that these soldiers acted on their own? That they purposely perpetrated acts that the Pentagon's own report (prepared by General Antonio Taguba) defined as "sadistic, blatant and wanton criminal abuse."

The Philadelphia Inquirer correctly editorialized "no one at the top—not military officers, certainly not Pentagon civilians—is blamed for wrongdoing. Never mind that a climate was fostered from the top down that tolerated, even encouraged, the abuse at Abu Ghraib."

In February 2004, the International Red Cross released a report detailing dozens of serious human rights violations that occurred in Iraq between just March and November of 2003. The report maintains some of the abuse was "tantamount to torture" and that methods included threats of electrocution, forced nudity and other lewd sex acts, forcing detainees to wear hoods and more.

WHO SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE?

First, Secretary Donald Rumsfeld is at the top of my list. Secretary Rumsfeld, according to numerous reports, personally authorized similar abusive interrogation techniques for prisoners held in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, including the use of dogs for intimidation, the removal of clothing, the hooding of prisoners, and "non-injurious physical contact." He also ordered several prisoners in Iraq, not at Abu Ghraib to be hidden from the International Red Cross so that the organization couldn't monitor their treatment. Now, however, we are supposed to believe that such actions at Abu Ghraib were a mere coincidence and not orchestrated by anyone?

Second, Lt. General Ricardo Sanchez: Despite two Army investigations, one of which stated he "failed to ensure proper staff oversight" of Abu Ghraib, he has yet to be officially sanctioned, punished or charged. Moreover, as the Washington Post reported this week, "Army intelligence officials in Iraq developed and circulated "wish lists" of harsh interrogation techniques they hoped to use on detainees in August 2003, including tactics such as low-voltage electrocution, blows with phone books and using dogs and snakes—suggestions that some soldiers believed spawned abuse and illegal interrogations." General Sanchez is known to have approved these rules of interrogation.

Third, Major General Geoffrey Miller: According to the Center for American Progress: "a Guantanamo commander, Maj. Gen. Geoffrey Miller, was sent to Abu Ghraib to "Gitmoize" it. Under his command, the International Committee of the Red Cross found interrogation techniques at Guantanamo Bay are "tantamount to torture." "Harsh methods" used at the prison include forced enemas, sleep deprivation and chaining prisoners to chairs and leaving them "to soil themselves." Just weeks after he visited Iraq, the now-infamous abuse occurred at Abu Ghraib.

Fourth, White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales: Gonzales was instrumental in shaping U.S. policy on the interrogation of prisoners. In the now infamous 1/25/02 memo to the president he wrote, "the war against terrorism is a new kind of war" and "this new paradigm renders obsolete Geneva's strict limitations on questioning of enemy prisoners and renders quaint some of its provisions." Gonzalez also advised President Bush that laws prohibiting torture do "not apply to the President's detention and interrogation of enemy combatants" and an interrogation tactic only constituted torture if it resulted in "death, organ failure, or serious impairment of body functions."

Last but surely not least, President George W. Bush: The President is not last on this list for no reason, Mr. Speaker. Harry Truman proudly proclaimed "the Buck Stops Here." It would seem this Commander in Chief believes the buck stops far before that Pentagon, White House or Oval Office.

Mr. Speaker, why is Congress receiving more information on these atrocities from the news media than the President, his staff or the Department of Defense on? Moreover, why does he refuse to acknowledge that either he or his immediate advisers are primarily responsible for the culture of abuse "Bring em on" spawned by their reinvention of prisoner interrogation policies?

Privates and Corporals in the Army Guard and Reserves are not responsible for the atrocities at Abu Ghraib and elsewhere. They were only operating in an atmosphere created, fostered and encouraged by top echelon at the Pentagon and White House.

Why are we not pursuing those truly responsible for these crimes? Harry Truman would fully assume the role of Commander in Chief—not just troop deployment but troop deployment and frankly, the truth.

[From the Register-Guard, May 9, 2005]

GO HIGHER ON ABU GHRAIB: TOP OFFICIALS SHOULD'N'T ESCAPE RESPONSIBILITY

Sooner or later, Pfc. Lynndie England will be convicted for her role in abusing and humiliating Iraqi prisoners at the infamous Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq.

Anyone tempted to shed tears over the prospect of the young Army reservist spending time behind bars need only remember the photographs that showed England leering as she pointed to the genitals of a male captive, and as she led a naked prisoner around by a leash.

These images shamed both U.S. critics and supporters of the U.S. invasion. They also had a devastating impact on American efforts to win support in Iraq and throughout the Middle East for the occupation and democratization of Iraq.

It was neither surprising nor upsetting then to learn Friday that the government plans to file new charges against England, whose guilty plea was tossed out and her court martial canceled earlier in the week. A

military judge, Col. James Pohl, declared a mistrial after Pvt. Charles A. Graner Jr., a former guard at Abu Ghraib, testified that the photos were taken for training purposes. That testimony undermined England's admission that she knew her actions were wrong and her acceptance of responsibility.

But England and the few other enlisted men and women who have faced courts martial in the scandal should not be the only ones to pay a price for what happened at Abu Ghraib. High-level military and administration officials must not be allowed to escape responsibility for a scandal that is far more of their making than of low-ranking soldiers. So far, Brig. Gen. Janis Karpinski, an Army reservist who formerly ran U.S. prisons in Iraq, is the only high-level officer to be disciplined, and she rightly regards herself as a scapegoat.

Congress, which abandoned its oversight role during the invasion and its bloody aftermath, should demand an investigation by a bipartisan independent commission similar to the Sept. 11 commission.

Instead of starting at the bottom, as the military's whitewashes have done, the panel should start at the top with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, who failed to plan for postwar Iraq and then failed to adjust his plans after the insurgency began. Rumsfeld is the reason why there were insufficient numbers of prison guards in Iraq and why they had inadequate training and murky guidelines. Rumsfeld also made the decision to authorize harsh interrogation techniques for detainees at Guantanamo Bay and then to apply those methods in Iraq.

Next on the list should be Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, who three years ago prepared a legal opinion stating that Geneva Conventions protections for detainees in Afghanistan were "obsolete." That opinion, along with his endorsement of the harsh interrogation methods, contributed to the abuses at Abu Ghraib. Also high on the list should be Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, the former commander of U.S. forces in Iraq, who cleared the use of interrogation techniques in Iraq that violated Geneva Conventions.

The judge in England's case dismissed charges against her because of testimony indicating others were to blame. England should face justice. But the civilian and military leaders who sent her to Iraq and who bear larger responsibility for the illegal and immoral abuses that occurred there should be held accountable as well.

[From the Daytona Beach News-Journal, May 10, 2005]

ABU GHRAIB WHITEWASH

On Nov. 4, 2003, Manadel al-Jamadi was found dead in the showers of Abu Ghraib prison outside Baghdad. Al-Jamadi was a detainee who, according to a Navy SEAL testifying in a military court a year later, had probably been beaten by interrogators the night before. Several soldiers posed for pictures besides the body, grinning and with their thumbs up. Five months later CBS broadcast those images and many more, including those of naked Iraqi prisoners forced into human pyramids by their captors, of prisoners leashed like animals or terrorized by dogs and to the seeming entertainment of their American captors.

Whether American soldiers abused detainees "for their own amusement," as Pfc. Lynndie England put it to a military court last week; whether they did it as part of a systematic policy of abuse designed to "soften" detainees for interrogation; or whether the whole thing was "an over-hyped story," as The Wall Street Journal called it two weeks ago, the scandal shattered what little

credibility the American occupation of Iraq was clinging to when it happened. The hope, at the time, was that the United States would show the world that it was different, that it would be accountable.

"Watch America. Watch how we deal with this," then-Secretary of State Colin Powell said almost a year ago in a commencement speech at Wake Forest University. "Watch how a nation such as ours will not tolerate such actions. . . . The world will see that we are still a nation with a moral code that defines our national character."

There was reason to hope. But at the time, Powell and others believed that al-Jamadi's death was the only one on the military's prison watch in Iraq and Afghanistan and that abuse was limited to a few bad apples. It turned out that al-Jamadi's death was, indeed, the only one—at Abu Ghraib. In March, the Pentagon conceded that it was investigating 25 other inmate deaths it has classified as homicides in American custody in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2002. If that many inmates have been killed in prisons and detention centers under American supervision in the two countries, it is unlikely that the beatings, the abuses, the tortures that lead to such homicides would be limited to a few bad apples.

Yet that's the upshot of 11 investigations and reports of what went wrong. Some of the reports judged the Pentagon severely and called for corrective action and punishments. But it was up to the Army to act, because President Bush refused to give anyone else authority to do more than advise.

So the Army judged (and protected) its own. The Army has cleared four of the top five officers overseeing prisons in Iraq. It isn't clear whether it has investigated officers supervising prisons in Afghanistan (with at least two reported inmate deaths) or Guantanamo Bay. Of 353 cases of abuse the Army investigated (the number alone belies any suggestion of a limited problem), 225 are closed. Of 124 soldiers who faced disciplinary action, virtually all were the small fry of enlisted personnel. While 17 have been thrown out of the Army, seven low-ranked soldiers have faced punishment that range anywhere from forfeiting half a month's pay to—in one case—10 years in prison. One general, Janis Karpinski, was demoted and given a written reprimand. She was in charge of Abu Ghraib prison.

That's it. That's where U.S. accountability ends. Condoleezza Rice, Powell's successor at the State Department, told Europeans during her visit a few weeks ago that "bad things happened at Abu Ghraib that, as the president said, make us sick to our stomach. But the real test of a democratic country is how one deals with those." The sickening test result is the scandal has been lumped on the back of just a few lowly soldiers.

CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today more than 400 union workers and Members of Congress gathered in front of the United States Capitol delivering a united message: vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

This week, the presidents of Central America and the Dominican Republic are touring the Nation on a United States Chamber of Commerce-funded junket, pushing the Central American

Free Trade Agreement. They are traveling to Miami and Los Angeles. They are going to Albuquerque and to my State, Cincinnati, Ohio, attempting to convince the American people and the American press that CAFTA is good for their countries and for their people.

Unfortunately, these leaders are not telling the whole story. Like our own President, they try to convince us that CAFTA will lift up low-income workers in Central America and that CAFTA will create jobs here in the United States. What they have not said is that CAFTA does nothing to ensure enforcement of labor provisions in their own countries. What they have not said is that the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations, the combined purchasing power of the CAFTA nations, is equal to that of Columbus, Ohio; or Memphis, Tennessee; or Orlando, Florida. In other words, people in Guatemala and Honduras and Nicaragua and El Salvador and Costa Rica cannot afford to buy the steel produced in Pennsylvania. They cannot afford to buy cars made in Ohio. They cannot afford to buy textiles and apparel from North Carolina and South Carolina and Georgia. They cannot afford to buy software from Northern California or Oregon or the State of Washington.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to the Central American leaders, what they are not saying and what millions of us know already is that millions of their workers in Central America, like tens of millions of American workers, do not support the Central American Free Trade Agreement. What their leaders will not tell the American people, what their leaders will not share with reporters covering their junket, is that 8,000 Guatemalan workers protested against CAFTA in March. Two of them lost their lives when government forces attacked the crowds.

We have not heard Central American leaders mention the literally tens of thousands of El Salvadorans who protested CAFTA in 2002. They do not mention the 18,000 letters sent last year by Honduran workers to their Honduran Congress decrying this dysfunctional cousin of the North American Free Trade Agreement. The Central American leaders do not mention the 10,000 people who protested CAFTA 1½ years ago in Nicaragua. They do not tell us about the 30,000 CAFTA protestors in Costa Rica just last fall. Hundreds of thousands of workers have protested CAFTA in more than 45 demonstrations in these six Central American countries.

Opposition to CAFTA here in the United States has been equally stalwart. More than a year has passed since President Bush signed CAFTA. Every other trade agreement the President has brought to Congress has been voted on within 6 or 7 weeks. This has been 11½ months since the President signed it because there is so much opposition from American workers, from American educators, from American social service organizations, from

Americans of both parties. Instead of supporting the President on CAFTA, overwhelming numbers of Republicans and Democrats in this body and across the country have come out against the agreement.

Last month, two dozen Democrats and Republicans in Congress joined more than 150 business groups and labor organizations echoing a united message: vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Under NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the U.S. has lost more than 1 million jobs. Under NAFTA the promise of a thriving middle class in Mexico was never realized. Under NAFTA, just like every other trade agreement, the administration, the corporate leaders make the same promises. They promise more manufacturing jobs in the United States. They promise growth in industry in the United States. They promise more exports from the United States. But it never happens that way.

The definition of insanity is repeating the same action over and over and over again and expecting a different result. We have heard these same promises about CAFTA, about NAFTA, about trade with China, about the World Trade Organization. We have heard these same promises over and over and over again, and the American people understand the promises simply do not work.

Now the President and his big business allies are hoping that bringing these Central American leaders on their Chamber of Commerce junket can help deliver support for an agreement that, frankly, as we look across this Chamber, is dead on arrival. Right now the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is hosting a reception for the visiting dignitaries, these six presidents, rewarding them for their lobbying efforts this week. Right now the leaders of these countries are raising their toasts to their corporate sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no more delay. We must throw out this failed agreement and renegotiate the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

□ 1945

SMART AND VETERANS MENTAL HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we recently passed the conference report on yet another supplemental appropriations bill for the war in Iraq, bringing the total amount of taxpayer money being spent on this ill-conceived, built-on-lies war to over \$300 billion. The longer we keep funding this irresponsible effort, the more harm we are doing, not just to the people of Iraq but also to our very own troops.

The New England Journal of Medicine recently reported that as many as

one out of four veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq treated at VA hospitals in the past 16 months were diagnosed with mental disorders. Alarmingly, this number has been steadily rising, and we can only guess how many soldiers do not come forward to get help because of the stigma that is associated with mental illnesses.

Post-traumatic stress disorder, also known as PTSD, is the most common disorder seen in returning soldiers and has been diagnosed in 10 percent of returning soldiers at VA hospitals. Other mental disorders that are being seen are drug or alcohol abuse, depression and anxiety disorders. Also phobias and panic are part of the whole diagnosis.

These are the hidden scars that young men and women who serve in combat are left with when they return home. While mental and emotional problems cannot be seen as easily as a physical wound, they are just as debilitating.

Large numbers of veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan are coming home, and they are showing up in our homeless population in numbers that have not been seen since the end of the Vietnam War. This is a shameful epidemic, and we must work to confront it before it is too late.

Serving in a combat zone not only affects soldiers but also their families. When service members come home, they face a real challenge in learning how to readjust to civilian life, often taking a toll on relationships with family members and sometimes leading to even more mental and emotional problems.

Every time we send our young men and women into combat, we are asking them to make a huge sacrifice for the rest of us. Their lives and their health are the real follow-up costs to any war. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 35, asking for the immediate withdrawal of troops from Iraq. Thirty-three other Members of Congress have signed my resolution with me, because we know that the longer we keep our troops in harm's way, fighting a war of occupation, the higher the costs in human lives. Coupled with that bill, I am also reintroducing legislation to support a SMART security platform for the 21st century.

SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment to non-proliferation, and it aggressively invests in the development of impoverished nations, with an emphasis on women's health and women's education.

We must take a smarter approach to our foreign policy and homeland security measures. The sacrifices made by our soldiers are so great. We should be asking them to make sacrifices only after careful and thoughtful deliberation, not rushing to war on unreliable

intelligence and on personal grudges. We must take careful and measured steps when putting lives on the line, something that the Bush administration has not done.

As we work to protect those who protect us, instead of throwing our money into an ill-advised war, we must commit first to keeping our troops well equipped with safety gear and modern equipment, and we must provide them with real and comprehensive health care, including mental health support services, when they come home.

Mr. Speaker, war has long-lasting effects on those who serve. Let us work to ensure that we limit those effects by using our troops only when we must and treating them with the dignity they deserve when they return.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CORRECTING AMERICAN FISCAL PROBLEMS AND PRESERVING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is an honor to come before this House of Representatives. I can tell you that this 30-Something Working Group, Mr. Speaker, that our Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), has designated this time every week for the 30-Something Working Group to come to the floor to not only speak to the Members but also have an opportunity to share good information in general with the American people, and that is why we are here, to represent them, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say, in the last several weeks, we have been talking about the issue of Social Security. I can tell you that Social Security is not only at the forefront of the agenda in this Congress but also has been promoted throughout this Nation as being in a state of crisis, which it is not.

So, tonight, the 30-Something Working Group, we have asked a member of our caucus to come, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), to come to talk to us a little bit about this double whammy

that the American people will be going through because of the push of privatization of Social Security and the irresponsible spending by the majority side and also by the present administration.

This whole debate is about helping future generations. This whole debate is about making sure that we keep our end of the deal to the American people. I can tell you, keeping our end of the deal to the American people is saying we are going to do what we said we are going to do from the beginning, Mr. Speaker, and it is important. But I believe when misinformation or inaccurate information is given to the American people and to some Members of this House, it jeopardizes our commitment to keeping our end of the deal.

What I mean by "our end of the deal," for those individuals that have paid into Social Security over the years, and they are looking forward to the security of Social Security being there for them at the benefit level to where it is now, I think it is very, very important that we do not let those Americans down.

I want to make sure that not only the Members of this House but everyone understands that Social Security will be solvent for the next 47 to 50 years at the present benefit level of where it is right now. Forty-eight million Americans who need the survivor benefits, retirees or individuals eligible for Social Security at this point will receive 100 percent of the benefits they are receiving now. On average, they receive \$955 of monthly benefits from Social Security. Thirty-three million Americans are retired that are in that 48 million, and a large number of those Americans would be living under the poverty line if it was not for Social Security. So when we start talking about privatization of Social Security, it is a very dangerous thing and something that we should not play around with at all.

I am proud that Democrats on this side of the aisle, and I would even say some of my Republican friends, believe in strengthening Social Security without slashing benefits that Americans have earned and making sure that private accounts are not a part of the Social Security debate or reality, because there is strong evidence, not hearsay, strong evidence of major benefit cuts to Americans that are counting on Social Security.

I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, that the Members understand that, once we can get to the point that we stop insisting on private accounts, when it really does not add up for the individual that is receiving Social Security or that will receive Social Security, I think we can get on to not only a serious discussion but action in dealing with the question of Social Security.

We should not increase the debt by some \$5 trillion and gamble on the future of Social Security. I think the American people deserve better. I

think the American people demand better, and I think the American people will continue to pay very close attention to what is being said and what is not being said in this discussion about Social Security.

I do not believe that Members of this House or the other body will take a vote where they are going to make a career decision on a gamble on Social Security privatization. It is not at that point to where one has to gamble with the retirement of so many Americans. Social Security is there to make sure that it is a guarantee for men and women that have worked in this country.

So, tonight, we are going to talk about the budget, the \$26,000-plus that every American owes to the Federal debt, and tonight, we are going to, if I could use the word, cross-pollinate, Mr. Speaker, Social Security privatization philosophy and the reality of the ever-growing deficit, that it seems that this Congress is out of control of continuing to add on to the debt without any plan whatsoever, no real realistic plan, in making sure that we take down the debt for future generations. So I think that is very, very important.

Now, some individuals will say, Well, what is the Democratic plan? Well, I would like to know what is the Republican plan? Some of my good friends in this Chamber are Republicans and want to know the Republican plan.

I would say, the Republican leadership plan, because I do not want to generalize, because I feel there are Members in this Chamber that have a genuine argument and concern when they see statistics that are given by notable organizations and even by some of our Federal Government organizations that are saying that there going to be major benefit cuts if we go to privatization, to the point that where even individuals who do not enroll in private accounts are going to receive cuts. That is not fair.

So that is the reason why we come to this floor, week after week, the 30-Something Working Group, along with others, to be able to talk about this issue.

Now, tonight only are we going to have the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), who is always here, Mr. Speaker, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and we have one of our 30-Something Working Group members, the gentleman from the Great State of Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), who will come before this great House to be a part of this discussion, along with our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, the Democratic ranking member of the Committee on the Budget and a part of the Democratic leadership team in dealing with the issue of the deficit and the budget and responsible spending and also making sure that we do the right thing.

I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). As you go to the well there, I want to just let you know how

much I appreciate not only the hard work that you have been doing but the fact that you have joined us here, the 30-Something Working Group. I know you have been really given to not only the Democratic Caucus but informing the Congress on what we are doing and what we are not doing.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), feel free to be part of this, also a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me say, I enjoyed serving here with your mother, and she has every right to be proud of the service her son is rendering here. He was well raised.

The young in this country, and you fellows are young by my reckoning, have a right to be concerned about the course that our government, the Federal Government, is taking under President Bush. Obviously, we have a huge problem with our own budget, our budget deficit.

President Bush enjoyed an advantage that practically no President in modern times has enjoyed. He came to office with a surplus that his economists projected to be \$5.6 trillion between 2000 and 2011, over a 10-year period of time, an unprecedented surplus.

It was not just a projected surplus. The year before the year 2000, the last fiscal year of the Clinton administration, the United States Government ran a surplus of \$236 billion.

□ 2000

That was the context, the fiscal context in which President Bush came to office.

Today, when we closed the books on September 30, 2004, that fiscal year, we had a deficit of \$412 billion. OMB is still predicting a deficit this year, even bigger. But CBO has some good news. They tell us that revenues are coming in at a faster clip; and they are hopeful that deficit will be coming down to \$350 billion. But \$350 billion is only something to cheer in the context of deficits that have been running at a level of \$412 billion, the highest level deficits in our history, and we went there in just 5 short years.

What we are effectively doing, I say this to the young people of America whom my colleagues represent, is leaving our children and grandchildren the tab for fighting a war, letting them pay for the lion's share of it by simply adding it to the national debt. We are adding to national entitlements. We are cutting taxes, above all, and then borrowing to pay for the revenues we give up by the tax cuts and letting our children pick up the tab, pay the bill.

I often go to civic clubs; and I tell them, there is clearly a fiscal problem for the United States Government's budget, because the more we borrow, the more interest we have to pay and, pretty soon, debt service begins to eclipse accounts in the budget, like education, that are critically impor-

tant. But in addition to that, this is a moral problem. It is a moral problem when we shove these mountains of debt off on to our children and grandchildren. That surely is what we are doing.

Quickly, let me just show my colleagues what we have here. This chart, which has its own mountains, shows us where President Clinton started in 1993, at a deficit of \$290 billion. On the floor of this House, by one vote, we passed the Clinton budget in 1993, one vote; and every year thereafter the bottom line of the budget got better, better and better, to the point where we had, as I mentioned a minute ago, a surplus of \$236 billion in the year 2000. Since the election of Mr. Bush in 2001, the budget has gone down and down and down every year; the bottom line of the budget has gotten worse to the point where we had a record deficit of \$412 billion last year.

Now, the Committee on the Budget and President Bush both tell us we have a plan. We have a plan that will cut that budget deficit in half over the next 5 years. Well, we can cut a budget deficit in half when we leave out some of the biggest items that we are likely to face over the next 5 years.

One of those is the cost of eventually dealing with the alternative minimum tax. More and more taxpayers are having to pay the AMT instead of the regular tax; and when that problem is finally fixed, it will have to be politically an inevitability, because it will, by 2010, affect 30 million tax filers. We will have to fix it. CBO says the 10-year cost in revenues lost to fix the AMT so that it only applies to the upper bracket taxpayers for whom it was intended is \$642 billion in lost revenues.

Then there is the cost of our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq. We just passed an \$82 billion supplemental. There is not a dime in the President's budget after 2005 for the cost of those troops; and CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, has said we need to have some kind of national estimation of what it is likely to cost to keep those troops there, assuming that they will be gradually redeploying. So they said, let us assume that there will be 40,000 troops, 20,000 in Afghanistan, 20,000 in the theater around Iraq for the next 6, 7, 8 years. Their calculation is \$384 billion. That cost is left out of the President's budget.

So major items have been left out. We have gone back and put in items that are not contentious, not controversial, but politically realistic; and we can see from this chart that the deficit does get a bit better, because the economy gets better; but 10 years from now, we have a deficit of \$621 billion; \$621 billion.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important not only that the Members understand, but the American people also understand. I mean, the gentleman is the second most senior member on the Committee on Armed Services; and I think that the gen-

tleman is in the right position on the Committee on the Budget, that this is Iraq, the early years. I mean, this is going to be a long-term commitment of the United States. We are there; we are going to be there for some time. The coalition is getting smaller. We need to make sure that we provide for these men and women and their families back here.

So I just wanted to say that so that the Members understand that we have an overall responsibility, but some of the things that the gentleman is showing us here on this chart of the realities that are obviously coming in the future and, on top of that, the Social Security issue, is going to be a train wreck in the making, if not already there.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, we can see it coming down the track. This chart depicts it as graphically as we can make it. The deficit never rises below, never falls below \$350 billion, and rises to \$621 billion. Tally that up and we will see a mountain of debt added over the next 10 years, and then we have to pay debt service, we have to pay the interest on that debt; and that debt service begins to encroach upon other necessities, other critical priorities of the government like education, like health care.

So this is why we are concerned, the gentleman and I, and we, we are leaving to the next generation this legacy of debt. Surely, surely this generation of Americans, like every generation, which has strived to leave their children a better life, a better world, a better economy, does not want to be remembered for leaving our children and grandchildren a mountainous legacy of debt; but that is the course we are on right now.

Let me stop there so that we can yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for yielding to me. Let me begin by thanking my colleagues and my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and I have only served with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) in the Congress for a very short period of time, but the gentleman has been such a stalwart on this issue during the time that we have been in Congress.

This is not a subject that necessarily just jumps out at people as an exciting or sexy subject, but it is so important to our country to talk about the problem and the consequences from our debt and our deficit. There is no one who has been more of a stalwart in this institution than the gentleman from South Carolina, and I certainly thank him. As well, I welcome the person who will follow me tonight, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) who has, in a very short period of time, just since January, already distinguished herself as one of

the ablest and most intelligent Members of this institution; and we are thankful to have her here this evening.

I know that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) was in my district very recently, in Selma, Alabama, with me during March of this year when we commemorated the march across the Edmund Pettis Bridge; and the day after that march, I had a town hall meeting in that same city, Selma, and the purpose of the town hall meeting was to talk about Social Security and our country's future. There was a moment at the end of the town hall meeting that I want to share with the Chamber of that night, because I think it is so illustrative of the challenge that we are facing.

There was a young woman who was about 19. She said she was a college freshman, and she stood up and she asked me and the panelists a question, and her question was something like this: she said, young people today, and younger workers today are paying into a Social Security system that may not be around or may not be around in its current, robust form for us young people. So she asked the question, why do we have to pay at all? Why do we as young people, she said, have to even pay into a system that may not be there for us?

When I heard that young lady make those comments, two things occurred to me. The first one is that we have fallen a ways in this country if our young people today are full of cynicism and not idealism; if our young people today are wondering why we have to meet our burdens instead of wondering why we cannot meet greater burdens, something has happened to us that is wrong.

There was another thing that occurred to me.

Sometimes I think in this Chamber we have the illusion that we are arguing about money. We have the illusion that we are arguing about line items in a budget, that we are arguing simply about techniques of accounting. That young lady's comment made me realize we are arguing about something far more fundamental in this Chamber every day, and I would define it this way: exactly what do we owe each other? Are we obligated to each other, or are we cut off from each other's common destinies? That is what this political debate is about, and I hope that is what the American people understand this debate to be about.

As we saddle future generations with debt, as we saddle future generations with the consequences of tax cuts that we could not afford, as we saddle future generations with our mistaken fiscal choices, it is a retreat from the politics of obligation; it is a retreat from the idea that we are connected to each other and each other's fate and each other's destiny.

Increasingly what I fear is that we are entering a world where the only morality that we recognize in our public space is the morality of the market-

place. The gentleman from South Carolina touched on that. He talked about morality, and that word should not be in any way omitted from this conversation, because the morality of the marketplace is a very narrow morality. It says that to whom much is given, much will continue to be given. It says that the strong shall have the opportunity to get stronger, and it says that other than a little bit of sympathy and a little bit of charity for which we get a tax write-off, we do not owe a whole lot to the other people in our society.

I think that if we are to be true to the legacy of this institution and true to the people in this country, that we need a broader public morality than this narrow morality of the marketplace. We need a public morality, a way of talking in the public square about what we owe each other, what we owe our veterans, what we owe our young people, what we owe our working families, what we owe our college students, what we owe our disabled workers, what we owe all of the people who may not sit in the circle of prosperity today, but who desperately want to do so and want to have a chance to sit there tomorrow.

The budget resolution that we voted on 2 weeks ago and, essentially, we voted on it 2 months before that, because it did not change a lot from the House version to the final resolution passed by both Houses, it is a document that I think does not meet our best moral impulses; it does not meet our best impulses about what we owe each other as a community.

The gentleman from South Carolina and others have detailed on this floor and elsewhere the cuts to veterans, the cuts to our young people, the cuts to all kinds of commitments and obligations that we have to our environment, to our workforce development system in this country; but once again, the stakes are broader. Because what this budget does is to slowly but surely begin to walk away from the idea of national commitment and national obligation. It slowly but surely begins to walk away from the idea of commu-

nity. I make these final two sets of points before I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida tonight. I happen to think that we do have an obligation to get our fiscal house in order; there is no question about that. We cannot sustain these deficits; we cannot sustain this debt. It is unconscionable the President wants to add to it with his Social Security plan. It is unconscionable that the President does not have a long-range plan to pull us back from deficit.

But this is what is the real moral rub, I think, for a lot of us. So often in the last 4 years, the Bush administration and our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side, have asked sacrifice, but they only do it of some of the people. John F. Kennedy, whom I admired greatly, and whom I know the mother of the gentleman from Florida (Mr.

MEEK) admired and whom I know you admired a great deal, when he was inaugurated, he spoke on the idea of sacrifice and the idea of common burden and obligation. He did not speak of a sacrifice that falls only on working families who need Medicaid in Tennessee and Mississippi and Alabama. He did not speak of the sacrifice that falls only on veterans whose premiums do not need to go up. He did not speak of a sacrifice that falls only on families who are needing section 8 housing and do not want the program gutted. He did not simply speak of burdens and obligations that fall on the weakest of us.

I listened to the discussion that happened in the hour before us tonight, and the eloquence of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) on who has power in this Chamber, who has power in this institution. It is increasingly the most well-off among us, the most narrow-minded among us who are committed to a very narrow pursuit of the private interest. That is a full-scale retreat, with guns blazing, from the idea of what we owe each other as a people and as a community.

So if our country is going to move forward, I say to the gentleman from Florida, and if we are going to move forward and become what I think that we can be, we have to return to this idea that we do owe each other something more than sympathy, that we do owe each other a commitment to building a financial future that will work for our children. We owe each other a commitment toward a true and enduring retirement security for our seniors. We owe our young people a commitment and an investment in their skills; and, finally, we owe our country a way of talking about politics and a way of talking about our expenses and our expenditures, a conversation and a dialogue that somehow draws us together.

The final point that I will make tonight is, and so often I see this when I go back to town hall meetings in my district, last night I was in Choctaw County, Alabama in Butler, and so many people are frustrated when they see us arguing about things that do not matter to them.

□ 2015

We have been here for 4 months, and we have had a pretty busy schedule. We have voted on all of probably one really truly important piece of legislation this year, and that was the budget. We have had a lot of distractions, and we will keep having distractions on the floor.

But the people are so frustrated that we are angry at each other over things that do not matter in their lives, and they want us to repair to a higher standard. So I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) for being here tonight. Again, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership and his wisdom. And I would be happy if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) will yield to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, first, let me say what a pleasure it is to have the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) join us for our 30-something working group. I have to tell you, as the freshman in the group, and the person who has been here for the shortest tenure, one of the most incredible experiences I have had is to have the opportunity to learn from the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and especially the inner workings of the budget and to be able to absorb the expertise, at least attempt to absorb the expertise that the gentleman has been able to provide this country with your leadership. So I cannot thank the gentleman enough for that.

And I really want to pick up on what the gentleman from Alabama was saying because this really is, the budget is a statement of our values. It is our values versus the Republican leadership values. And it really is probably the most comprehensive expression of the direction that we believe the country should go in and the priorities that we have in our caucus versus the priorities that they have.

And, you know, it is interesting, look at the group of us assembled here tonight. I do not think that you could have a more eclectic group of Members than the Members assembled here. I represent a district, Miami Beach, Ft. Lauderdale and Hollywood. The gentleman represents Alabama. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and I share communities. And the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) represents, you know, a district in South Carolina. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is here with us tonight. We could not have more diversity in our caucus and more diversity represented here tonight.

And if you look at the homogeneity on their side of the aisle, even when they do not have homogeneity in their caucus, they walk in lock step. They fall in line. They do what they are told. And that is regardless of the fact that they have crafted a budget that clearly says to the American people: We do not care. We do not care about you. We do not care about making sure that your children have a quality education. We do not care about making sure that if your child is sick that you can afford to take them to the doctor. They have engaged, at least since I have been here and that I have been able to note, in slash-and-burn politics.

I mean, the thing that I think is the most interesting is that, over the time that I have been involved in public service, you know, we are constantly trying to figure out, and the American public, people, I think, are trying to figure out, how do you define a Republican, and how do you define a Democrat?

And I think that the budget document that they have put forward is probably the best expression of how you define what it means to be a Republican. And clearly, what it means to

be a Republican is to balloon the deficit, cause the Nation to go further and further into debt, mortgage our children's future, cut health care, cut education, both in the lower grades as well as student loans.

And if you look at our budget document that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) put together, it also is an expression of our values and the direction that we would take the country. Our budget document, as crafted by the gentleman from South Carolina and the other Budget Committee Members would bring the budget into balance by 2012. It would make sure that we do not cut the programs that are the most important to the American people.

What are our priorities? Education, health care, making sure that we can improve the quality of people's lives and making the world a better place as opposed to improving the bottom line of the pocketbooks of the wealthiest Americans. I mean, that is essentially what the ultimate goal was, clearly, of the Republican budget document. And I think it is important that we help lay that distinction out in front of the American people so that, over the course of the next 18 to 22 months, they can make a decision as to whether we want to continue to move in the radical direction that they are taking this country or if we want to get things back on track.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ). I thought the gentlewoman and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) shared some really good comments.

I see that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has a board there that he wants to share with us, and I know the gentleman has some comments based on our comments.

Mr. SPRATT. We have a number of different deficits. One is the Social Security deficit. The actuaries at the Social Security Administration tell us that the shortfall in Social Security funding over the next 70 years is \$3.7 trillion.

What Mr. Bush is now proposing as a purported solution to that is to allow workers to divert 4 percentage points off their payroll tax, one-third of their payroll taxes into private or personal accounts and away from the Social Security trust fund. This will have enormous consequences.

First of all, everyone can see that it is counterintuitive. If you have got a trust fund which is \$3.7 trillion, do you resolve that problem by diverting a third of the revenues away from that fund, so that you virtually double, and then some, the shortfall in the account?

That does not square with anybody's understanding of how to resolve this problem. But it is of particular concern for younger Americans, because they will be paying substantial sums into Social Security, and they may get, unless the reform being discussed is done

differently from what the President proposes, the worst they will get out of Social Security. Thus far, Social Security, every generation would say, has been a success story. It has made the fabric of America a better country, a better society.

A lot of young people walk up to me, I would say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), and they say: I do not ever think I will see my Social Security or at least nothing like what is promised to me. I am paying in big bucks, 12.4 percentage points of my gross income, after accounting for what my employer also pays. And I do not ever think I will see what I am contributing come back to me.

And I tell them all, Social Security is not just a retirement plan. Social Security is also a plan particularly for younger families. As a matter of fact, 37 percent of those on Social Security today drawing benefits are younger Americans who are disabled or have had a family member, a breadwinner, die, or they are the dependents of these particular beneficiaries of Social Security.

Social Security provides the equivalent for, let us say, a young couple, age 27, two children, it provides the equivalent of \$403,000 in term life insurance. And for those who become disabled, nobody thinks he will, but many do; for those who become disabled, it provides \$353,000 in disability insurance, which would be hard to buy in the individual market. And that is not to mention Medicare, which comes with the Social Security disability. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If I may, I just want to ask a question, because I think this pie chart really paints the picture, literally. People think that this Social Security debate, some people do, feel that it is just about people that are already retired, and they are concerned about their retirement. Yes, valid point. They should be concerned because we do know, and you were a Member of the 108th Congress and many congresses before that. The President stood in the well there and shared with us, if you are over 55 you do not have anything to worry about.

But I remember vividly in the 108th Congress, when we talked about the prescription drug benefit plan, they said it would be \$350 billion only, and now we know it is \$724 billion and probably climbing as it relates to costs.

But disabled workers, that can happen any time in your lifetime.

Mr. SPRATT. And it does. One in seven workers ends up on disability before retirement.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And that is Social Security. And what we do know, and I hope that you would get an opportunity to talk about, the President's plan cuts benefits twice on one of the charts that I know you have there, to let the American people know that and also Members know that when you go to privatization that you lose benefits. I mean, that is what the record is reflecting right now. And I

think it is important that everyone understands what is happening.

Mr. SPRATT. This chart shows it as graphically as we can express it. There are two claws impinging on Social Security under the President's proposal. First of all, most Americans do not understand this, but when you go to retire, if you have elected to put money into a private account, the first thing you will have to do before Social Security computes your benefits is pay Social Security back. That private account, that ownership account, is really a loan from the Social Security Administration. You have to pay back, upon retirement, every dollar you have diverted into a private account plus interest at 3 percent over the rate of inflation. That means that there will be a significant privatization tax which gets bigger and bigger over time, depending on how many years you are in the work force.

In addition to that, there is another factor buried in all the detail which is critically important because it changes the nature of Social Security. And that is that basic benefit computation will be free formulated. Let me express that differently.

Today, when you go to retire, the clerk at Social Security takes all your earnings from age 14 onward, takes the highest 35 years, averages those, brings them up to a present value, and then, each year, the amount of income that you can get is dependent upon a formula that is used to derive what is called the PIA, the primary insurance amount. You get 92 percent of the first \$627. You get 30 percent of the next \$3,779, and you get 15 percent of everything else. That is complicated.

But the net result of that is that lower-income workers tend to get more, a better deal out of Social Security than the higher-income workers do. It has this effect to it that makes it a social insurance plan and not just a retirement plan.

If you change the way that benefit is indexed every year, which the President proposes to do. Today that basic benefit will be indexed and changed according to the rate of inflation and wages in our economy.

The President wants to change it to price inflation. That is economic talk. But it is critically important in a practical sense because, over a 70-year period of time, it will slash in half the basic benefit to which you are entitled from Social Security. And this chart shows it right here.

Someone who is retiring in 2075, born in 2010, a couple of years from now, 42 percent of his accumulated benefit in his private investment account will have to be paid back to Social Security; 56 percent of the remaining amount will be diminished by the recalculation, the reformulation which President Bush is proposing. So we have what is left that this chart shows. You start out with the big blue bar, all along here. That is scheduled benefits under Social Security.

The green amount beneath that shows the traditional Social Security benefit to which you are entitled; in 2015, it makes up most of your benefit. But by 2045, about half of your benefit is traditional Social Security, and half is in your private account.

When you get to the 70th year, almost all of your benefit is coming out of the private account, and only a small part, this little green tip down here, is coming from traditional Social Security. So we are going to ask you, the young people of today, the families that are 30-something with kids, raising them, to continue paying that 12.4 percent in the traditional Social Security, only to get this in the way of traditional benefits out of it. It is going to change the nature of the program in ways that cannot even be fully anticipated.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me follow up on the comment that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) just made, because a lot of very reasonable people, as you know, believe that this scenario you described is not accidental. It is not just a by-product of the President's strategy, but it is, indeed, the President's strategy, to turn Social Security, which is a universal benefit that the American people collectively pay into, to transform it from that world into a world, frankly, where it looks like a conventional welfare program, a program where very poor people receive a benefit from it and the rest of the population receives very little.

Now, what happens to those kinds of programs? Number one, the Republicans cut them every year. They do not fare very well in this budget process. If you look at the programs that we have in this country that we fund out of our sense of charity, Section 8, walking away from it, housing, dealing with the disabled and mentally ill, all the programs that we fund out of our altruism, unfortunately, those are the programs that are getting cut. I do not believe that this is an accident, that the Republican party and President of the United States are taking this plan that has worked enormously well and refashioning it into a program where, frankly, people will have less of a stake in paying into it.

The second observation, I would say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), is that it is indisputable that Social Security is the most successful government program in the last hundred years in terms of its ability to move people from the margins of life to a state of security. When Social Security was passed in 1938, 52 percent of the seniors in this country lived in poverty.

□ 2030

Today that number is down to 9 percent.

If every other government program had been as effective in reducing poverty, there probably would not be more than 20 or 25 Republicans here because

we would have won the whole political debate. This has been an extraordinarily successful program and part of the reason it has been successful is the stake that we all have in its benefit.

I make one other point tonight. A lot of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, well, you Democrats have been criticizing our proposals. Why do you not come forward with a better and stronger plan for saving Social Security, and never mind that the President has no plan to make it solvent, why do you all not come to the table with one?

There is a part of this debate that we should not miss tonight. Part of the reason that we are expecting a gap in Social Security financing, a shortfall in Social Security financing, is because of this administration's estimates of slow growth in the next 30 to 40 years. And a Republican Party that used to pride itself on economic optimism even in the face of no evidence has now become the party of slow growth. They tell us that our productivity will inch around at a rate of around 1.9 percent for the next 30 years, or our growth rate will be around 2.1 percent.

What is the reason that they project slow productivity and slow growth? The major reason is because right now in our country the gap between skilled and unskilled workers is more pronounced today in the middle of the first decade of the 21st century than it was in the early 1970s and the late 1960s.

In other words, the gap between the people who know how to do the work in this country and who are trained to do and those who are not so lucky or so fortunate is greater than ever.

That is creating an albatross on our whole economy. And if we are serious about tackling the Social Security problem, we have got to come up with a growth strategy. We have got to come up with a strategy to close that gap between skilled and unskilled workers. And the extraordinary thing about this budget is that it cuts money for workforce development. It cuts out programs like Upwards Bound and TRIO that take at-risk kids and give them a leg up. It cuts economic development programs. It cuts all of the things that would narrow and close down the gaps that exist in American life.

In other words, at a time when we ought to be investing more in our future, we are investing less. Once again it takes us back to the point that the gentlewoman made about the fundamental definitional divide between these parties.

President Clinton who grew 22 million jobs in his Presidency understood that when you spend money on education, when you spend money on worker training, when you spend money on developing skills you are making investments. And those investments reap an enormous return for this generation and the next one.

So I say in conclusion before I take my leave tonight that if we are to deal

with this problem of Social Security having a shortfall over the next 30-some years, if we are to deal with these gaps that exist in our skilled and unskilled workers that lead to the slow growth the administration promises us, we need a different set of priorities. We need to remember the value of expenditures that are investments.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to do is take off from what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) was saying because the President started out this debate 4 months ago following the election saying that Social Security is in crisis, that Katie bar the door, we have to do something, we have to do something now; and if we do not, then the world will essentially come to an end.

Now, he has gradually backed off that and you do not hear the word “crisis” out of the President anymore. You hear more along the lines of what we have been saying which is there is a problem that needs addressing; and we have been saying that because you have the strength of a 70-year safety net in place, that we should not be irresponsible about how we reform it. We should not be irresponsible by slashing a gaping hole in that safety net through which millions of people would fall.

And because this is the 30-something Working Group, I have often pointed out that when we talk to our friends, our peers who are also members of our generation, I know I ask my friends if they think that Social Security will be there for them when they retire. I am 38. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is 38, and we have friends who do not believe that Social Security will be there. Yet, if we look at the numbers, all the reliable numbers, the ones right from the Social Security Administration, the first instance that we have even a concern about whether or not we are going to be taking in as much as we are paying out is 2041.

Well, I will be 74 years old in 2041. And if you are using the more reasonable, non-Dooms Day numbers, it is more likely that 2051 is when we begin to approach a problem. I will be 84 years old. Now, that is about 20 years past normal retirement, so the sky is not falling.

There is a problem and a responsible government will recognize that problem and take the time to make the changes that we need to make without throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, following up on what the gentlewoman has said, this chart spells it out, it is a little busy, but the President and others who are claiming there is a crisis point in 2017, 2018 as a pivotal year, that is the year when incoming dedicated revenues will be exceeded by outgoing scheduled benefits. But Social Security at that point in time, the trust fund will be sitting on a reserve, a cache of U.S. Treasury bonds equal to \$4.7 trillion. The interest on those Treasury

bonds will not only continue to ensure benefits in full; they will actually add to the surplus, the corpus of the trust fund, so that in the year 2027, \$6.5 trillion will be in that cache of Treasury bonds held by the trustees of Social Security.

Now, at that point in time the interest income will no longer be adequate to fully cover the benefits outgoing, but with \$6.5 trillion in Treasury bonds, by redeeming those bonds the system is assuredly solvent until 2041.

As the gentlewoman just said, the actuaries of Social Security are paid to be conservative. They are paid to be very, very cautious and they are. The rate of growth they are assuming is a very, very modest rate of growth. We do not want to be fools, so we take a very conservative view of things. But the CBO has taken a slightly more realistic view of the future and they say, we think you will make it to 2052. We think the system then will be able to pay out 78 cents on the dollar, not fully but substantially, and after that something in the range of 78 cents on the dollar.

So the system is faced with problems down the road, but we have got time to fix them. The sooner the better; and if we fix them right, we will not have a problem.

I was here in 1983. Social Security really was in trouble in 1983. Some forecasted that it would scrape bottom, run dry in the retirement trust fund in July of 1983. President Reagan got together with Tip O’Neill and the leadership of the Senate. We appointed a truly bipartisan representative board. You had Mr. Greenspan at one end. Claude Pepper at the other end. Dan Moynihan here. Jim Baker there. They got together and they came up with a menu of different choices to which every stakeholder contributed something. And the result was the system was made assuredly solvent for the next 60 years.

That can be done again. There is no reason we cannot do it again, and everybody then can breathe easily. But you cannot do it and incorporate these private accounts which are carved out of Social Security and make the shortfall today twice as large as it actually is.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What I wanted to bring out was exactly what the gentleman was talking about. We have a problem that needs to be addressed. But we can not throw our Nation’s retirement security, our constituents’ retirement security, to the whims of the stock market and then add insult to injury by saying that we are going to adjust their benefits based on the price index as opposed to their wages, because obviously wages grow more quickly than prices do.

So their benefits are going to be cut both through the indexing and through the privatization and on top of that will add to the deficit.

This is about the most irresponsible proposal that I have ever heard of.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if I can, before we walk too far away, before we walk too far away from what the gentleman said, the fact that he was here in 1983. I will tell you how this argument works.

In 1983 I was in high school. I was a senior. The gentleman is still a good man. I was a senior in high school. And we know in that year it took a lot of leadership because there was a big Democratic majority here in this House and in the other body across the hall. There was a Republican in the White House, but on behalf of the American people, and there was a true crisis and the gentleman described it. And I just happen to have the vote here.

Here in the House it was 243 people that voted for it, voted for that bipartisan proposal. It took leadership in this House and in the White House, and that is what it will take in this debate. In the other body, we had 58 of our colleagues down the hall, 58 of them voting for it at the time.

That was a bipartisan bill. It was not something that was one sided, and that is what is wrong with this debate now.

I want to make sure that Members and the American people understand. If we were in the majority, we, Democrats, that it would be a bipartisan approach because many folks do not understand, well, why are they talking about it? Why do they not just do it?

Well, we want to do it. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Democratic leader, wants to do it. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means, want to see a bipartisan approach. But that is not happening right now, and that is the reason so many things are happening to the American people in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for being here and raising the intellectual level of this debate that we usually have.

Mr. Speaker, I had a town hall meeting last night on Social Security in Green, Ohio, just south of Akron. And it was 2 or 3 to 1 against any kind of privatization.

There was one point I wanted to share tonight. There was a woman who was there who said she was actually for the private accounts until she, I think, found out a little bit more about them. The 4 percent that the President says that you can divert and put into a private account, she made \$19,000 a year. Now, 4 percent of her income, of \$19,000 a year, is never going to be enough for her to be able to retire on.

And there was a gentleman who was there who said that he made 30-some thousand dollars a year his whole life, never any more; he did not have any money to put extra into these personal accounts. What he would have put in, he went back and did the math, would

have never worked out to him receiving the kind of money that he would have been able to get through Social Security.

So it may sound good that you are making a lot of money every year that, hey, I will get a little extra and put that in the market too. But what about those people who are struggling now more than ever, making 19, 20, 25, \$30,000 a year. Four percent of that is peanuts to say that you will be able to retire on.

So as we have this debate about the personal accounts, I think it is very important for us to recognize that diverting 4 percent of your Social Security taxes into this is never going to be enough for this to retire on.

□ 2045

That was really the only point I wanted to make here. I want to thank the gentleman for joining us. Throughout, since I have been here, he has been the guru on the budget. We all follow his lead. So I thank him very much.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have about 3 minutes left. So if the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) wants to make some closing comments, he can.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing we have not spoken about. We have talked about the budget deficit. We did not speak about the trade deficit, \$666 billion, also an encumbrance we are leaving our children. We did not talk about the jobs deficit. In the last recession, 2.5 million manufacturing jobs, the best of our jobs, were lost, that have not come back. Service jobs have but not manufacturing jobs.

One of the solutions to all of this has got to be education. We have got to have a workforce that is educated as never before in American history, adaptable, keen, intelligent, quantitative, and if we look at the budget the President sent us for the first time since 1988, a President of the United States requested less for spending on education than we are currently spending at the present time.

He wipes out vocational education, \$1.3 billion. Wipes out the drug free schools. Wipes out GEAR UP for underprivileged kids who want to get a college education. Wipes out Even Start. Wipes out educational technology.

There are some plusses and puts and takes so that a lot of these do not come out on the bottom line, but when we consider everything, this is the least forthcoming education request at a time when education was never needed as much as it is now. So we have got an education deficit as well.

That is why we are out here tonight, to talk about the 20-somethings and the 30-somethings and what they can expect for the future of America. We have got deficits, which means that we are leaving negative legacies in numerous different areas that we have got to reverse, we have got to undo, and it starts with the budget. We simply cannot keep stacking up mountains of

debt which we shove off into the future for our children to pay.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I just appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. MEEK) leadership and the opportunity for us to help explain to our generation what the ramifications will be if the President's proposal goes through. I think it is real important that we plug the Web site, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) has it up here on the board.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We even want e-mails from Members, but definitely from the American people and others. 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov is our e-mail address. We always look forward to receiving e-mails.

As we close, I just want to not only commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership but for the leadership of this Democratic Caucus here in the 109th Congress and the 108th Congress, which I have served in, and presently serving in the 109th, for standing up and saying what is right, making sure that we watch out for future generations; just for the charts that are being generated out of the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) committee staff and from the gentleman, I tell the American people and also I tell Members of the majority side, if it is about defense, then 44 percent of our debt is owned by foreign countries, up drastically since President Bush has taken office.

This chart that the gentleman showed dealing with retired workers of 62.8 percent that is dealing with Social Security, that the benefits they are receiving, 13 percent of workers that have disabilities. I mean, these are real issues that are facing families in America right now, and this is a moral issue as the gentleman mentioned.

Spouses with children, 10.1 percent, and survivor benefits, the highest outside of retired workers, 14.1 percent. These are individuals that their loved ones, mothers and fathers, have passed on, and they are living on the benefits that they left behind. Sometimes that is all they had to leave. The most shocking chart that the gentleman provided to all of us here is how the benefit structure goes down, 34,587 cut.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, once again for allowing us to have this time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1544, FASTER AND SMARTER FUNDING FOR FIRST RESPONDERS ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida) from the

Committee on Rules submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-77) on the resolution (H. Res. 269) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1544) to provide faster and smarter funding for first responders, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1279, GANG DETERRENCE AND COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida) from the Committee on Rules submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-76) on the resolution (H. Res. 268) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1279) to amend title 18, United States Code, to reduce violent gang crime and protect law-abiding citizens and communities from violent criminals and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1268) "An Act Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution honoring the Tuskegee Airmen for their bravery in fighting for our freedom in World War II, and for their contribution in creating an integrated United States Air Force.

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to transfer Charles Ghankay Taylor, former President of the Republic of Liberia, to the Special Court for Sierra Leone to be tried for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other serious violations of international humanitarian law.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1268.

EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here. I am pleased to follow the 30-Somethings, although I am a

little bit old for them. I think the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) might be a little bit old for that as well, but I want to talk about a different subject matter, as interesting as Social Security is, and I will share time with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), my distinguished friend, on this subject which is essentially dealing with education in the United States of America and the Federal role in education which is frankly largely not understood by everybody who deals in education in this country. Perhaps we can bring a little bit of light to that.

The starting point here is really the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is right now 40 years of age. It was 40 years ago last month that President Lyndon B. Johnson signed what we know as ESEA, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, into law, and the core mission of that Act when he signed it into law 40 years ago and was really one of the times the Federal Government has really got involved in education was to help disadvantaged students improve academically, certainly a laudatory goal I think as far as any of us are concerned.

We have now enacted No Child Left Behind, and many people refer to that as if it is something separate and different and new. What it really is, a lot of the elements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with an overlay of some additional requirements as far as standards and assessments are concerned.

President Johnson, when announcing his plans for the Great Society touted the goal of an end to poverty and racial injustice. When addressing education specifically he said, The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talent.

The ESEA arguably triggered the most significant Federal role in elementary and secondary education. When he did sign that Act into law, President Johnson explained that, "By passing this bill, we bridge the gap between helplessness and hope for more than 5 million educationally deprived children."

So where are we now some 40 years later as we look at No Child Left Behind? Well, progress has been made since the enactment of the ESEA, and sometimes, it is hard to measure that, but I think by any standards, if you look at the various aspects of that Act, we can certainly claim that there has been progress. Nearly 4 decades later, however, poor and minority children still lag well behind the education curve. It obviously has been through a lot of cycles, kids going first through 12th grade in that 40 years.

In fact, a huge gap still remains when it comes to ensuring that all kids are actually learning. No Child Left Behind built upon numerous reauthorizations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and was driven to eradicate this problem and to ensure that every

student will not only have access but will also receive a quality education.

The Federal Government has spent more than \$300 billion on K-through-12 education since 1965, which was the date of enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Yet that significant academic achievement gap that I referred to between disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers still exists in key subjects, such as reading and math.

According to the recent national data on this subject, by the time African-American students reach eighth grade, only 12 percent can read proficiently, and only 7 percent are proficient in math. Nationally the achievement gap between Hispanic and Caucasian fourth graders is 29 percentage points.

We have allowed ourselves to believe that some children are simply beyond our reach. No Child Left Behind is rooted in the belief, a different belief, that all students, regardless of race, background, income, geography or disability, can learn and must be given the chance to do so.

In the true spirit of President Johnson's vision, and like many other laws that passed during the Great Society, we are helping all students.

As Brent Staples recently wrote in the New York Times, No Child Left Behind happens to be the best hope of guaranteeing black and Latino children a chance at equal education. Its core requirements that States educate minority children to the same standards as white children breaks a century old tradition of educational unfairness.

I think that captures that as well as it can be captured in a short sentence or two.

For the past 3 years, the Federal Government, States, school districts, parents and especially students have been dedicated to reforms that ensure no child is limited. We are engaged as a Nation in a continuing dialogue about our public education system. Despite the often unfavorable tone, the fact remains that people outside the education community are focused on reforms established by No Child Left Behind. No Child Left Behind has its skeptics, and change is never easy.

Many have complained that the Department of Education has been inflexible with implementation. This has not, however, been the case. The U.S. Department of Education continues to not only be an important voice in helping to implement the law but an ear to some of these negative accounts.

Some of that flexibility I have put on this chart, which I have to my left, that they have undertaken, particularly in the last 2 years.

The first of these is flexibility on testing students with disabilities. It has been shown that some of these students simply are unable to stay up at a class level with other students, and some flexibility was introduced in order to address that, mainly in the percentage of children who would be exempted from the testing.

Flexibility on testing students with language barriers: Again, there are demands that the kids be able to master the English language and be able to test in that language eventually, but we are seeing the need for some slow-down there.

Flexibility for rural schools on high-quality teachers: High-quality teachers mean basically teachers who are proficient in the subject matter which they are teaching, and obviously, if you are a math teacher, you are proficient in math. You studied math or history or English or whatever it may be; you studied that particular subject. But obviously it is not always that easy, particularly in rural areas, particularly for teachers who are teaching more than one subject, that they be highly qualified in that area. So some latitude has been issued as far as that is concerned.

Flexibility of student attendance issues: Some of the attendance numbers were high, demanding some flexibility, although not much, was introduced in that particular category.

Flexibility toward raising student achievement, a new path for No Child Left Behind, and again, that is an important subject in terms of where we are going to advance as far as No Child Left Behind is concerned.

So the Department, I think, has been a lot more flexible than anyone has really given it credit for in terms of what they have done. They continue to review this, and some say, Well, what is happening in the Congress of the United States?

We, in the Congress, will look at this again, not this year or next year but the year after that in what we call reauthorization. So, in the meantime, the Department of Education is doing its job, and we are preparing to do our job as far as the reauthorization is concerned to make sure that this program works.

The bottom line is that students realize that there are standards in place now in all 50 of our States. There are assessments in the form of testing in place in all of our States, and probably, this will eventually go on as a matter of fact to high school, as well as the grades which it is in now, in a more formal sense than it does at this point.

Mr. Speaker, most recently, Secretary Spellings, who is now our Secretary of Education, by the way, and, I think, doing a splendid job, announced a set of guiding principles to help States implement No Child Left Behind while taking their unique situations into consideration.

I know my State, which is the State of Delaware, is that we have had a couple of submittals of different plans that have been accepted, and there has been a great deal of flexibility as far as the States are concerned, but these principles include ensuring students are learning, making the school system accountable, ensuring information is accessible and parental options are available and improving the quality of

teachers. To me, it is pretty hard to fight these things. To me, that makes a heck of lot of sense in terms of educating the young people of America.

If a State is meeting all of these principles, the Department will take that into account when discussing amendments to State accountability plans. This approach, if carried out fairly and in the true intent of the law, could help some issues that have been raised throughout the implementation process.

So this is being looked at. These demands are being made. In a moment, I am going to return to this and talk about the funding and talk about some of the student test scores and how they are doing better now than they were before as we understand the difficulty of the greater demands which are there but of making absolutely sure that that is translated into help for our children across the United States of America.

□ 2100

Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). I must just say this: my colleague has a scientific background. He is, I hate to use the word fanatic, but I can almost use it in this case, because when it comes to math and science, there is no person probably in the history of this Congress that has been more of an advocate for this than he has. And by an advocate, he goes out to see if there are laws he can change, speeches he can make, writings he can pursue in order to shift policies. And he has made a difference as far as that is concerned. He has been a stalwart friend of mine and a stalwart friend of, I think, everybody in education. He has been on the Committee on Education and the Workforce with me for a number of years now, and so it is always a pleasure to work with him.

So at this time I will yield to him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for the glowing introduction. I will return the compliment, and the gentleman from Delaware has done a superb job of chairing the subcommittee dealing with education. I appreciate his efforts. He deals primarily with K-12 education and is largely responsible for all the good things that we have done and that he has been talking about.

My first comment is simply one I have to get off my chest, because I heard so many falsehoods about this last year during the campaign when individuals were asserting over and over and over that we Republicans had passed No Child Left Behind, but we had not provided funding for it. That is just utter nonsense. If you look at the history of what the appropriations were from the Federal Government for K-12 education before No Child Left Behind was passed and what they have been after, it is clear that there is a huge difference.

I believe my colleague will probably discuss that later and show a graph which shows how rapidly it has increased under the Republicans. Republicans are the true friends of education and have been for years; and this is a dramatic demonstration of it, increasing 148 percent in our funding over a short number of years.

Now that I have that off my chest, I will talk about math and science education. The No Child Left Behind bill contains some provisions which were not in there before, and that is that students not only will be tested on reading but also on math and science. They are being tested on mathematics right now to find out how well they are learning and how much they are learning. In the year 2007-2008, for the first time, they will be tested on science. And States are, as we speak, drawing up requirements, standards that the students must meet, and they are developing appropriate tests for those standards.

Now, why is math and science so important? A lot of people think, well, it is great if you want to be a doctor or an engineer or a scientist, fine, take math and science. But if you do not want to be any of those, why bother? Well, I will tell you why it is important. Because the jobs of the future are simply going to require that the individuals applying for those jobs have an understanding of the basic principles of science and mathematics. It is that straightforward.

I can give a good example of that just in my personal experience. Last year, I was driving down the highway and listening to National Public Radio, and they were doing a story about grease monkeys, or what used to be called grease monkeys, mechanics who work on cars. In the course of doing the story, they interviewed a service manager of a dealership and asked, what do you look for when you hire a new mechanic? He said, first of all, they have to have had high school algebra and high school physics.

That was amazing to me, because when I graduated from high school many years ago, those who were planning to become mechanics did not take physics or algebra because they did not need it. They were planning to be mechanics, so why bother taking it. But the world has changed. The cars back then had no computers under the hood. Today, there are literally hundreds of microchips under the hood of every car. And anyone who wishes to be a mechanic had better understand how to do the diagnostics, how to read the curves and graphs the diagnostic equipment displays. And so that is just one example out of many.

My district has a lot of manufacturing, as does much of Michigan; and when I tour those factories, it is a different world today. The people who work on those machines understand math and science. And if they do not, they will not get that job. They are making good money, \$60,000 or \$70,000 a

year. But they earn it because they have studied hard to learn math and science, and they have learned it well.

Our country in the future is going to need good technicians, good mathematicians, good scientists, good engineers, but also good factory workers, because the jobs in the factories are changing. Jobs in retail are changing. Jobs in many areas of life are changing, and we have to do a better job than we have been.

How have we been doing compared to other countries? The Third International Mathematics and Science Study, which occurred a number of years ago, was very revealing. In the United States, the fourth grade was a little below average in mathematics. By eighth grade, we were way below average. By high school, our students, our high school students compared to those of other industrialized countries were second from the last.

Now, I have never regarded America as a Nation to be second from the bottom. I have never regarded our Nation to be average. We should be better than average. But our students are not performing in mathematics.

A similar test for physics was even worse. We were dead last of all industrialized nations in high school physics. More recent tests bear the same trend out. We are just not meeting the needs of the future. We are not competing with other nations. We are losing ground to them.

A lot of people say, why do kids really need it? Well, I talked about the jobs of the future, but let me outline that it is more than just that. We need scientists and engineers to provide the kind of innovation that will keep jobs here. We constantly complain about jobs going to China, to Mexico, to Thailand, and to India. Why are they going there? It is not just the different wage rate. It is the fact that they have highly trained scientists and engineers, whereas in America, engineering enrollments have gone down steadily for the past 20 years, just starting to come up the last couple of years.

In China, they went from producing far fewer engineers than we do to producing more than four times as many engineers every year as we do, and they are beginning to innovate. They are beginning to develop new products. They are developing new factories, and we are falling behind in that.

But there are other reasons to teach math and science. Consumers today need to know when they are in the marketplace, they have to know something about science to read all the labels on materials and understand what there is in these foods and what is in these products they are buying, whether they are safe or not, and how do you read the labels, the content labels and the warnings.

Also, voters have to know. Today, with referenda, particularly in California, they frequently have referenda on things such as the environment. Last election they had one on stem

cells. How are the people supposed to vote on these if they know nothing about math and science?

Math and science also produces thinkers and learners. It is a different learning process to learn math and science. I hear this a lot from people: oh, it is so hard. Do our kids really have to take it? Or, I just could not get math when I was in school. I hear this over and over. What they fail to recognize is that math and science require a different mode of thought because science uses a different mode of inquiry. I do not think it is any harder than anything else, but it is a different way of learning, something most students have not experienced before if they have not had good math and science education in the first eight grades.

I recall a case where I was teaching a student when I was a professor at the University of California at Berkeley. She came in with a total mental block. This was the most elementary physics course in the department, Physical Science 10. She said, I cannot get this stuff. I cannot get it. I cannot get it. And I worked and worked with her, and spent hours with her; and finally she saw the light and learned how to think properly. I had not heard from her for years after she left my class. When I came to Congress, I got a little note from her. She is now the director of a laboratory in Wisconsin. So even someone who felt they had no hope of passing learned how to learn, and from then on it was good.

But also we have other reasons for it. Economic security. The better jobs go to those who understand math and science. National security. The Rudman Report of a few years ago made the most striking statement I have heard, and that is that the greatest danger our Nation faces beyond nuclear war is the fact our students are not able to compete in the world market and, therefore, we are facing dramatic problems in our Nation if we do not improve.

Now, what can we do about this? Everyone always blames the teachers first. I have worked with teachers in the classroom for some 30 years. I have gone in the classrooms, I have taught myself, I have taught the teachers how to teach students, and I will not say a bad word about the teachers. Because all the teachers I worked with earnestly wanted to do a better job of teaching. The problem is they had not been taught math or science properly. They had not been taught how to teach it properly, and they just felt it was hopeless. They did not know where to start, what could they do.

So I believe our role as the Federal Government is to provide training opportunities, both preservice and inservice training for teachers, teaching them math and science, but also how to teach math and science. In addition to that, we need improved curricula that really teaches science the way it should be taught.

The way to teach science is by doing it, not by talking about it; and that we have to get across. Because the kids love science if it is taught by doing it. They love doing the experiments. They love figuring it out. But if they have to just sit and read a book and memorize all the terms of science, it is not going to appeal to them, and they will not learn what science is all about.

So we need inquiry-centered curricula. We need hands-on curricula, where kids actually use materials and work with them; but it also has to be based on the concepts of science. Too often education programs emphasize either inquiry or they emphasize the hands-on approach or they emphasize concepts, and they all argue with each other about what approach to take. To me the answer is simple: it is all of them. You combine all of those and develop curricula that really meet the needs of the kids, keep them excited and interested, and also provide the teacher training so the teachers can teach those courses.

We are facing a crisis because of this. But there is another reason: India and China. Almost 20 years ago, India made the decision that the only way they were going to compete in the world today is by developing strong backgrounds in math and science, and they had a unique way of doing it. They set up an institute of science, mathematics, theoretical physics, and all these things, similar to MIT and Harvard combined, and set that as the goal for every child in the nation to achieve. And it really worked. All the parents wanted their kids to go to that school. It was the best school in India, and arguably one of the best in the world. So the parents wanted their kids to go. They made sure they studied math and science hard.

Now, obviously, not all of them made it; but in the process of trying, many of them ended up learning enough math and science so that when they got to the university, they could study more math and science and choose one of many different careers.

In conclusion, let me just say that we live in a very competitive global economy. If we are serious about competing in this global economy, we have to make certain that we work smarter. And to do that we have to make sure that our kids are smarter; that they learn the right things in school; that they are fit for the job market of the future; that we can compete with these other nations and beat them at their own game, and that we can maintain our strong economy in the face of this global competition.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield back to the gentleman from Delaware, and I thank him for accommodating me for such a lengthy discourse.

□ 2115

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his continuing and abiding interest in this

subject. I am afraid sometimes the rest of us do not take as much note of it as he does. Perhaps we had a little trouble with the math and science ourselves, I guess. But I understand how important that is. Every time I talk to companies, to people who come into Delaware looking to locate in Delaware, they make a big fuss about that. We happen to have more Ph.D.'s per capita than any other county in the country in New Castle County. As a result of that, there is a great deal of interest in research in our area. I understand the importance of this. We need to sell the message to a lot of people out there. The gentleman from Michigan is the one who really helps sell it.

Mr. EHLERS. If the gentleman will yield, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments. It just reminded me of something I often say to students when I am in high schools. I tell them, Look, you have a choice: You can either be a nerd, or you can end up working for a nerd. Which would you rather be? That is what it is likely to come down to in the future because, if you do not understand math and science, you are not going to have a really quality job.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the gentleman for all his help in this area. He touched on something that I want to turn to now with these charts because some of the strongest criticism that we have heard concerning No Child Left Behind has been with respect to the funding, specifically the Federal Government's role in funding the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

If we look carefully at these charts, we begin to get the true picture of what is happening in the funding. Let me go through it word by word. Education Funding, Discretionary Appropriation Increases, Fiscal Year 1996 to Fiscal Year 2005. This is what the Federal Government has done for the funding of education. Although it says the Department of Education here, this money basically flows through to our States and school districts throughout this country. Federal funding for education has more than doubled over the past 9 years. Under the final fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill, discretionary funding for the Department of Education climbed from \$23 billion in fiscal year 1996 to \$57 billion for fiscal year 2005. That is an increase of 148 percent. That is a tremendous increase. We are talking about 15 percent, and maybe the math comes in handy here, 15 percent or more on an annualized basis. Most costs of living, when you measure it in government programs, is just that; it is cost of living. Usually it is 2 or 3 percent. So the Federal Government has stepped forward and said, We are going to make a larger commitment to education, and we have done that in the course of the last 9 years. I do not have the chart here to show this, but I would be willing to put a lot of money on the fact that the States and the local school districts have not

been able to keep up with this particular pace of funding that has gone into education.

Just one more chart while we are looking at these charts, and that is funding for programs under the No Child Left Behind Act, a 40 percent increase in 5 years, showing that, in the last 5 years since No Child Left Behind, we have also had very significant increases as far as No Child Left Behind is concerned to help with those programs. These are programs, by the way, which were being put into place by most of the States and most of the school districts in this country even before No Child Left Behind came along. I am very dubious of any argument saying the Federal Government has not done its share as far as that is concerned. I am discouraged, frankly, by States and organizations that focus more on the funding levels than on what the law is supposed to ultimately be providing to students, which is a quality education and the opportunity for future success. Many even argue that it is an unfunded mandate, that it is impossible for schools to implement the law at the funding levels provided by Washington, D.C.; This is a disingenuous argument at the very best.

The nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, which you may know as GAO, released a report in May 2004 which discredits comments that No Child Left Behind is an unfunded mandate. The GAO reviewed more than 500 different statutes and regulations enacted in 2001 and 2002 and officially concluded No Child Left Behind is not an unfunded mandate. Even more clear are the significant increases in Federal funding of Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs since the enactment of No Child Left Behind as was shown by those charts. According to the U.S. Department of Education, Federal funding for programs encompassed by No Child Left Behind has increased \$17.4 billion, as I indicated, representing a 40 percent increase in just 3 years. Included in this number is title I funding for disadvantaged students and schools, which is funded at \$12.7 billion in fiscal year 2005, an increase of 45 percent since No Child Left Behind was signed into law. That is significant, because that is the money that is going to the schools that have the most low-income children in their schools.

It should also be noted that, in 1994, President Bill Clinton signed the Improving America's Schools Act, a reauthorization of the ESEA, that required States to develop standards and aligned assessments for all students. Districts were required to identify schools not making adequate yearly progress and take steps to improve them. Bill Clinton, 1994.

This makes two important points. First, States across the country should already have been implementing accountability systems similar to what is required under No Child Left Behind. The previous reauthorization included

many of the same provisions, just without the necessary teeth to ensure compliance. Second, during that time, Congress did not appropriate the same levels as were authorized in the act. Democrats funded education in the same manner when they controlled Congress and the White House.

Yes, raising the student achievement levels are difficult and expensive. The fact remains that the Congress has been funding the program. States and organizations should not be avoiding their responsibilities to students on the back of a failed funding argument.

The hard work and dedication of those implementing No Child Left Behind is clear, and we can all agree with the law's goals. We are beginning to see results. Many educators across the country have stepped up to the plate. New test results for the 2003-2004 school year show students are posting high math and reading scores on States' tests. For example, in my home State of Delaware, scores have improved in three out of four grade levels in all three subjects tested, reading, writing and math. Fifth grade reading performance in Delaware climbed to 85 percent, a seven percentage point increase from last year. In Ohio, fourth grade math scores improved from 58 percent last year to 66 percent this year. Additionally, according to the Chicago Tribune, students in every grade level posted increased scores on statewide reading and math tests in the 2003-2004 school year. Finally, according to a 2004 study by the Council of Great City Schools, the achievement gap is narrowing in both reading and math between African-American and Caucasian and Hispanic and Caucasian students in our Nation's inner city schools, and they attribute the positive change in part to No Child Left Behind.

We must also recognize that the job is not done. We must see to it that all children are receiving a quality education. No Child Left Behind is a step in this direction, and we must stay the course. Any attempts to change the system would play into the hands of those who support the status quo, effectively preserving a failed system that does not ask if children are learning.

CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity here to address the House on an issue that I think has become more and more pertinent to the American people and to the American economy. One issue that I hear about almost as much as I hear about the Social Security issue back home in my district, which is north-east Ohio, I hear about the issue of China. We cannot, I do not think, speak of any kind of economic recovery

in the United States of America or talk about providing middle-class people with high-wage, high-paying jobs until we figure out the issue of China. I am going to have a brief discussion here tonight and show some charts just to kind of outline what has been happening here in the United States of America.

Quite frankly, I feel like it was an issue that was not discussed enough in the last presidential election. I feel like this is an issue that the American people want the politicians that are here in Washington, D.C., in this Chamber and leaders in government to talk about, and we have not been. Hopefully, with some legislation that I have offered with the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the China Currency Manipulation Act, this issue will become and come to the forefront of American politics. I just want to share with the American people some statistics, some charts that I think help outline exactly what has been happening.

This first chart here is the State crisis. It outlines here how many manufacturing jobs have been lost in the United States from June of 1998 to February 2005. As you can see, the red States here have lost more than 20 percent of the manufacturing that they have in their States. You can see the red from Maine, mostly in the North-east-Midwest quadrant, Ohio, Michigan. Ohio lost 216,000 manufacturing jobs. Then between 15 and 20 percent of manufacturing jobs lost are in the deep blue or the deep purple, Georgia, Florida, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, between 15 and 20 percent of manufacturing. These are the high-wage, high-paying jobs that have health care, that have a good retirement, that have a good pension. These are the kind of jobs that drive the middle class forward. And these are the kind of jobs and the kind of companies in Ohio and elsewhere that pay taxes, that workers pay taxes. They vote for school levies. They vote for mental health levies. They vote for library levies. They vote for all the things that are needed to help lift up local communities. What has happened because of this crisis that we have here, local communities are beginning to suffer. They are not able to pass the police and fire levy because the 216,600 workers who no longer work in a high-wage manufacturing jobs are left to go to Wal-Mart, are left to go to Super K or Kohl's and make very little money without health care benefits. If we think that we are going to maintain the kind of prestigious global power that we are today and hopefully will continue to be, there is no way we can do this by replacing General Motors with Wal-Mart or replacing Wal-Mart for General Electric. That is not going to be a great America in the 21st century. This graph, this billboard here, illustrates that point.

And so the issue of China inevitably comes up, and how are we going to deal

with it? Because we know, whether you are the owner of a small machine shop or a mold shop or in some light manufacturing, it is the Chinese goods that are coming into the United States that are helping wipe out the manufacturing that is here now. What is happening is the Chinese are manipulating their currency, and they are manipulating their currency to the rate of 40 cents on the dollar.

I have a factory back at home. They make tubing when you put up the sprinkler systems in industrial facilities and commercial facilities. It is called Wheatland Tube. Wheatland Tube has been a great company and still is. They have invested over \$8 million in the United States over the past few years. Their product is competing with a Chinese product. The Chinese are shipping their tubes into the United States. When the Chinese product, fully assembled, completely at the end of the manufacturing process, when it arrives in the United States of America, that Chinese tube is the same cost as the raw materials that Wheatland Tube has to buy. Wheatland Tube has not even begun the process of making their tubes. But the Chinese tubes have already been manufactured and produced, arrive in the United States less than the cost or the same cost as the raw materials for the United States company.

□ 2130

How can the United States company compete with that? It cannot, and that is why the United States in the previous billboard looked like it did.

This is a graph that has the U.S. annual trade with China. This line here, the gold line with the blue dots going up, is imports. These are Chinese products coming into the United States, and it goes up to \$200 billion in 2004. And we can see where it was in the mid-1980s and early 1990s, and it slowly began to rise.

The exports, what we are shipping to the Chinese, is this blue line, coming straight across. We are not able to increase our exports. And the funny thing is, if the Members remember back when we were signing all these trade agreements in the 1990s, when we were talking about we have to open up markets and we have to export products from the United States so that other people will buy them and we will make them here and we will ship them off and it will be great, that has not happened with the Chinese.

We were told when we signed PNTR, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, most favored nation trade status with the Chinese, we were told there is 1.3 billion people in China, we want to sell our products to the Chinese. It has not happened. It simply has not happened. These are the goods we are importing, these in the blue line is what we are exporting, and it is not working out. And when we look at the top 15 exports from the United States to China, three are either waste or

scrap products, three of the 15. Four of the 15 are raw materials or agricultural products, and six of the 15 are parts, which basically means we are exporting parts, raw materials, scrap, to China, which are manufactured there and shipped back only to be imported here in the United States.

The gold bars are the trade numbers with China, the deficit that we have, \$162 billion trade deficit with the Chinese. We are importing \$162 billion more than we are exporting to the Chinese. They are wiping out the middle class in the United States of America because of our trade policies here and because we are allowing the Chinese to manipulate their currency.

Now, if the currency situation was fixed in China, if they were not gaining a 40 cents on the dollar advantage, Chinese products that were made in China, the price would go up; and if the price goes up and they still try to ship it to the United States, our goods here would be more competitive, and then the Chinese would have currency that had more value so that when we shipped products, when we exported products to China, our prices coming from the U.S. would actually be cheaper to the Chinese consumers.

And the Chinese agreed, when they came into the World Trade Organization, that they were going to be fair brokers and they wanted to be a part of the global system. And we are not seeing much action by the Chinese. And, quite frankly, we need to be firmer here in the United States. And that is why the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and I, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), who signed on to our legislation, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO), AFL-CIO, China Currency Coalition, a lot of the small business trade groups, this is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This is an American issue. This is an American issue. And if we do not fix it, there is not going to be a middle class in the United States of America, and we are going to continue to see some of the older industrial cities and industrial areas in our country continue to struggle. Whether it is the county funding, police and fire, schools, we are not going to be able to survive.

This is a startling, stunning chart. This is the U.S. trade balance in goods. The U.S. trade balance in goods. The goods deficit which covers manufactured products hit a record \$651 billion in 2004. And from 1998 to 2004, a \$421 billion jump, just in these few years, from 1998. These are the hardcore manufacturing products which contribute to job loss here in the United States: steel, supply chains for all of the major corporations that have moved and have altered the trade balance with the Chinese to the tune of \$651 billion.

So we have to ask ourselves, why do we continue down a road where we are losing, we are losing this battle? And I do not know about anyone else, but I keep score, and when we are losing, we

need to stop doing what we are doing and fix it and apply the pressure to the Chinese that we need to apply until they fix at least their currency problem that is cheating everyone else who is trying to buy their products and in the U.S. up to 40 cents on the dollar. They are cheating.

And the reason this is so urgent for the United States of America to act now and not wait 10 years from now, not take the slow, diplomatic process that we have been taking, the reason it is so imperative is right now we are buying all their products. Right now we are consuming all of the Chinese products. They need us now. They need us now. And when they need us, that is when we have leverage to move.

Now, we also need to balance our budget because the Chinese are helping fund our \$500 billion deficit. So we ought to do our job here. But at the same time, we need to recognize what the U.S.-China Commission said and told Congress, submitted a report. First it said that the overall trade situation with the Chinese had an overall negative impact on the United States, overall negative. A bipartisan commission, people from the Reagan administration, people from the Clinton and Carter administrations, totally bipartisan.

The Chinese trade has overall negative implications on the United States. That is scary enough. But they went on to say that we have about a decade in the United States, about a decade, to fix this problem because at some point we are not going to be consuming as much as we are, because we are not going to have the kind of money here that we have now. We are not going to have the kind of wealth to be buying if we continue to go down this road. If jobs that pay \$50,000 or \$60,000 are getting replaced by jobs that are paying \$30,000 or \$35,000 without health care benefits, there is only so much we can consume, and that is what is happening. The jobs replacing the jobs that are leaving are \$10,000 to \$12,000 less a year without health care benefits.

So how are we going to keep up? And what the U.S.-China Commission has told us is that we have about a decade and we had better fix it now. And that is why this is so urgent. That is why we see bills, the Schumer-Graham bill in the Senate, talking about putting on 27 percent tariffs on Chinese goods coming into this country to try to stem some of this tide that is coming in, or whether it is the WTO-compliant Ryan-Hunter bill that is gaining a lot of support here in this Chamber because Members are beginning to recognize that this is a real problem in the country.

Our bill does not violate any of the WTO rules. It is compliant with the World Trade Organization, which I am not exactly thrilled with the World Trade Organization. I do not like the way they operate. I do not think it is a democratic body. I think it rubber

stamps decisions for multinational companies. There is no doubt about it. But what happens a lot here is someone will put a bill up that will say put 27 percent tariffs or 30 percent tariffs on Chinese goods and a lot of people in this body will say that is not WTO compliant, so we will not even look at it.

So the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and I went out of our way with a lot of very smart people to compose a bill that is WTO compliant because we want to get over that first hurdle. And we have because we have a good bill, and that is why it is gaining the kind of steam it is gaining. WTO compliant. And it allows the President to recognize currency manipulation for what it is, and that is a subsidy; and so it should be seen as any other kind of subsidy that other countries give in order to ship products into our country and hurt us domestically.

Currency manipulation is no different. If we are gaining 40 cents on the dollar, then that is subsidy; and it is no different than any other kind of subsidy. And our bill gives the President the tools he needs. We want to work with the administration. We have got three Chairs of Republican committees on this bill with the AFL-CIO, with the China Currency Coalition, with a tremendous amount of trade groups, mostly Republican small business owners. This is not a Democrat or Republican issue. And it is time for us in Congress to get the guts we need to make this happen because it is hurting average people in the country.

This is the U.S. manufacturing employment from January of 1999 to March of 2005. And we can see here that in January of 1991 we were at about 17.3 million jobs, manufacturing jobs; and we hit the recession in the early 1990s and we came out of it and peaked out in 1998-1999 at over 17.6 million manufacturing jobs. Not too bad. And then we peaked off in the end of the century; and when we hit January of 2001, here comes the downward slide, from 17.6 million in 1999 all the way down to under about 14.3 million jobs in March of 2005.

Look at this slide in U.S. manufacturing. And, again, it is the manufacturing jobs that are the jobs that have the high wages. They are the jobs that pay a decent wage, a real wage. They are the jobs that provide health care. These are the shops that are part of communities all over the country. These are not the big multinationals who can have the wherewithal to pick up and go over to China and ship the products back. These are the people who live in our communities who donate to the church. They are the small business owner who would donate to the school and give that little extra and the workers who had solid work can work overtime and contribute to their union and to their church and to the civic organizations in local communities, which would be the tax base that supported a lot of the local community.

□ 2145

We have all been there. In Northeast Ohio, it seems like it happens all too much, where a local company that has been in your community for 100 years, or 50 years or 60 years, all of a sudden cannot compete anymore. Then the county and the city and the local school district loses hundreds of thousands of dollars, and the crunch, the squeeze on the people in that community continues, and it ultimately results in a weaker United States of America.

Just a few final charts here.

We were told MFN, PNTR, NAFTA. Now we want to pass CAFTA here, which I do not think is going to make it. Now we are being told here in the U.S., and we were told all throughout the nineties, we are going to sign these trade agreements, and it is going to be really great, because the low wage jobs are going to go to the other countries and we are going to keep all the high-tech, high-wage jobs here in the United States and it is going to be a panacea here. Everyone is going to have a good job and work with their brains and not with their hands, and it is going to be great.

This is the total trade balance in advanced technology products. These are the millions of U.S. dollars. We had in the early nineties a surplus of millions and millions of U.S. dollars, all throughout the early nineties, throughout the mid-nineties into the late-nineties, and then we began the decline. These are advanced technology products. These are the things that appear in the computers. These are the things that appear in your cars, that you do not really know how they work, in airplanes, in televisions. We are losing this too.

We were told we were going to win on these. We are still losing on that too to the tune of millions and millions of dollars in deficits in the United States of America. This is a trend we need to begin to turn around, or our kids are going to be left with a country that is not as strong as it should be.

So we have been told, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) said about an hour ago in this very Chamber as we were talking about a lack of job creation and more or less tied to Social Security, the key in the United States of America, if we are going to compete, is we are in the process of creating a new economy and we do not really know what it is. We want to help with the Chinese and we need to fix the currency manipulation problem, and I think we are applying a lot of pressure to the Chinese now with some of the legislation we have here. Hopefully they will be able to do it on their own and we will not have to implement the kind of reforms here in the U.S. to give the President the power to do that. We want that done.

But, at the same time here at home, we cannot talk about our trade issues, we cannot talk about China, without fixing the problem here at home. We

need healthy and educated students in the United States of America who have access to a quality education in any school in the country, because that is the only way that they are going to move themselves forward, that is the only way they are going to be able to lift themselves out of poverty, that is the only way that these communities are going to be able to create and generate enough wealth, enough wealth, to be able to fund their schools and provide for libraries and all the different sorts of services that need to be funded. So we need to focus on education, as well as dealing with the China currency manipulation issue.

This is the budget the President submitted on education. Fifty appropriations will be below current services in the billions of dollars with that budget. You can see there are cuts of \$2.5 billion in 2006, \$6.2 billion in 2007, and then the same and even greater in 2008, 2009, and, by 2010, cuts of \$11.9 billion in the various education programs.

Something the 30-Something Group and I have been working on for a good many years now is college tuition and the Pell Grant. The Pell Grant, when it started, would account for 80 percent of a student's college tuition, 80 percent. Today a Pell Grant accounts for a little over 40 percent of a student's college tuition. An average student graduates with over \$20,000 in loans.

Here is what we are doing, the outpaced college tuition compared to what the Pell Grant is. Here is the Pell Grant minimum award, here in light purple, the Pell Grant maximum award in the navy blue, and then the average cost of tuition and fees in a four-year public college setting.

You can see how much it outpaces that, so this grant here no longer meets the need of what the average college student needs in order to go to school and get an education and allow them to compete.

So we have our work cut out for us. I commend to the American people this week's Newsweek, May 9 and the title, "China's Century, a Special Report." "China's Century."

The reason this is so urgent for us is not because America is perfect and not that America does not make mistakes, because we have, and we have articulated many of them on the floor here over the years, and we will continue to make mistakes. But when the question comes as to who will lead the world in the 21st century, will it be the Chinese? Will it be a Communist regime that is currently manipulating their currency? Will it be a Communist regime that is spending mass amounts on their military budget? Is it the Communist regime that has no concern for worker rights? Is it the Communist regime that has no concern for the environment? Is it the Communist regime that has no concern for human rights? Is it going to be the Communist regime that has no concern for religious freedom? Is it going to be the Communist regime

that will promote and implement a policy of forced abortions on their own citizens?

Or will it be the United States of America? Will it be the country that has promoted the middle-class, the country that does stand for freedom? We have many warts, but we do promote democracy. There are disagreements on how we go about it, but this is a democratically elected body here of human beings, of American citizens who make human mistakes. But this is a lot better, and this country is best to lead the world in the 21st century, not a Communist regime who has no concern for the human rights of other citizens.

That is what is at stake here in this whole debate. We could talk about currency manipulation and trade and funding and all these different political issues, but the bottom line with this whole situation is who is going to lead the world in the 21st century? If you want it to be the United States of America, we better use this window of opportunity to play tough with the Chinese; to tell them to fix their currency manipulation, or face the consequences.

This body needs to provide the President with the tools that he needs to be tough with the Chinese and force them to fix this issue, and then we come back home and we fix and fund and implement education reform and funding for education and funding for health for young children and young students all over the country, and let us get ready to go to battle in the 21st century with healthy, educated kids who have an opportunity at schools all over the country, with access to the arts and speech and debate and drama and music and foreign languages.

We can do it, but we have got to make it a priority and we have got to make it a goal. And this all starts, Mr. Speaker, with making sure the Chinese, if they want to participate in the global economy, they do it in a fair way. They agreed to play fair, and now they are cheating.

This body is primed to act, and we are going to act. It is going to start with facing down the currency manipulation problem and not allowing the Chinese to cheat to the tune of 40 cents on the dollar.

CONSTITUTIONAL GUIDELINES FOR SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, "I solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of which I am about to enter, so help me God."

Mr. Speaker, this is the judicial oath that justices of the United States Supreme Court take to uphold America's Constitution, the sacred manuscript our Nation was established upon, the foundation of who we are.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, some of the same justices who preside over the highest court in our land are systematically unraveling the threads of the very Constitution they vowed to protect. In what amounts to a most disturbing development, the United States Supreme Court continues to flirt with the temptations of foreign court decisions and the lure of opinions of international organizations. They do this in the interpretation of our American Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this trend is terribly troubling. Has the Supreme Court lost its way?

As a former Texas judge for over 22 years, having heard 25,000 criminal cases, I took the same oath as our Supreme Court justices, to uphold the United States Constitution. Never once did I make a decision based upon the way they do things in other countries. My oath was to our Constitution, not to the Constitution of the member countries of the European Union, such as France. America should not confer with the decisions of any of the hundreds of foreign powers on our planet. As Anthony Scalia, our justice on the Supreme Court has said, "those decisions are irrelevant in the United States."

In 1776, amidst a revolution, our forefathers signed the Declaration of Independence which stated brazenly and boldly the 13 colonies desire to dissolve political bonds with England. In this document, Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson penned among the list of grievances against King George the following statement: He said of King George, "He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws."

Mr. Speaker, 10,000 to 14,000 patriots over the course of 8 years in the American War of Independence spilled their blood or died to secure liberty for us and safeguard our constitutional rights.

□ 2200

The purpose was to sever ties with England forever. Then, in 1812, the British invaded the United States again. The British still wanted America to be subject to the King and their ways. They burned this very city, including our Capitol. President Madison and his wife, Dolly, fled Washington, D.C. in the damp darkness of the dreadful night to escape the invaders. The British were determined to retake this free Nation of America and this very soil on which I stand today. Americans defeated the British a second time to make them understand that we will not do things the English way.

Now, justices in this land of America, across the street from this very Cap-

itol, use British court decisions and European thought in interpreting our Constitution. What the British could not accomplish by force, our Supreme Court has surrendered to them voluntarily. Has the Supreme Court handed over our sovereign Constitution to other nations? Mr. Speaker, has the Supreme Court lost its way?

The Constitution is the basis for who we are, what we believe, and what our values are. My colleagues will notice, Mr. Speaker, the oath our judges take is to the Constitution; not to the government, not to the President. It is to the Constitution. That is because the Constitution is the supreme authority of the land. It is our identity. It is our path to justice for all Americans.

The Framers of the Constitution made clear their vision for the Federal judiciary. Named in Article III behind both of the other branches of government, the Founders intended a court system with a narrow scope and restricted authority. As Alexander Hamilton explained in one of the Federalist Papers, the judiciary, from the nature of its functions, will always be the least dangerous to the political rights of the Constitution, because it will be the least in its capacity to annoy or injure them. He states that the judicial branch is, beyond comparison, the weakest of the three departments of power.

Mr. Hamilton continued in his Federalist Papers, the executive dispenses the honors, holds the sword of the community. The legislature commands the purchases, prescribes the rules by which the duties and the rights of every citizen are regulated. The judiciary, on the contrary, has no influence over either the sword or the purchases, no discretion, either of the strength or the wealth of the society, and can take no active resolution whatsoever. It may truly be said to have neither force nor will, but just judgment.

Mr. Hamilton was wrong. History now reveals that the Supreme Court has become the most powerful of all the branches of government, although it was intended to be the weakest. And the people of this country cannot hold them accountable for their actions. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, an alarming number of judges deem the Constitution a bendable document, more like a catalog of suggestions rather than the rule of law; a set of elastic principles which, at the end of the day, can be easily interchanged with the judge's own personal policy and emotional agenda. As one author on the topic of our judges has put it, they see their role limited only by the boundaries of their imaginations.

And in the case of consulting foreign statutes to determine rulings here in the United States, a majority of our nine Supreme Court Justices even encourage it. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, for example, has said that although international law and the law of other nations are rarely binding on decisions in the United States and its

courts, conclusions reached by other countries and by the international community should, at times, constitute persuasive authority in American courts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are rarely binding, who decides when they are binding? Is this arbitrary justice? My question is, when do foreign court decisions matter, and when do they not matter? Do our judges pick and choose foreign decisions that they like and ignore those they personally do not like? Do they pick and choose to get a desired result?

Mr. Speaker, this is constitutional chaos. In one of her books where she shares her reflections on being a Supreme Court Justice, she goes on to say that she believes American judges and lawyers can benefit from broadening their horizons. I know from my experience, she says, at the Supreme Court that we often have much to learn from other jurisdictions. We Supreme Court Justices will find ourselves looking more frequently to decisions of constitutional courts, especially common law courts that have struggled with the same constitutional questions that we have. International law is no longer a specialty; it is vital if judges are to faithfully discharge their duties.

Mr. Speaker, all judges, all lawyers in the United States take oaths to faithfully discharge their duties to the United States Constitution. None of us took an oath to faithfully discharge international law and the duty to international law. Has the Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker, lost its way?

Another judge on our Supreme Court, Justice Ginsberg, also subscribes to the importance of international jurisprudence on the Court. She thinks the premise is wrong that you only look to your friends. She has asked why, if judges are free to consult commentary, restatements, treaties, writings of law professors, law students and law reviews, they should not analyze an opinion from, get this, the Supreme Court of Canada, the Constitutional Court of South Africa, the German Constitutional Court, or the European Court of Human Rights. In her view, the United States judiciary will be poor if we do not both share our experience with and learn from legal systems with values and a commitment to democracy similar to our own.

On a C-SPAN broadcast last month, another Justice, sympathetic to the use of international law and foreign court decisions, indicated that the Supreme Court is faced with more and more cases in which the laws of other countries apply. Where there is disagreement is how to use the law of other nations where we have some of those very open-ended interpretations of the word "liberty," and interpretations of the phrase "cruel and unusual punishment." This Justice believes it is appropriate in some instances to look to how other foreign courts may have decided similar issues. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what difference does it make

how they do things in lands far, far away?

In 2002, Justice Paul Stevens in *Thompson v. Oklahoma* raised global norms regarding a particular type of punishment in his opinions. He states the conclusion that it would offend civilized standards of decency to execute a person who was less than 16 years of age at the time of his or her offense is consistent with the views that have been expressed by respected professional organizations, by other nations that share Anglo-American heritage, by leading members of the Western European Community, the American Bar Association, the American Law Institute, who have all formally expressed opposition to the death penalty for juveniles.

Although the death penalty has not been entirely abolished, he says, in the United Kingdom or New Zealand, in neither of these countries may a juvenile be executed. The death penalty has been abolished in West Germany, France, Portugal, the Netherlands, and all Scandinavian countries, and is available only for exceptional crimes such as treason in Canada, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland. He concludes by saying, juvenile executions are also prohibited in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of how we feel about the execution of juveniles, the question, Mr. Speaker, is not what they do in the Soviet Union, but what does the United States Constitution say about this issue. Has the Supreme Court, once again, lost its way?

The same year, in *Atkins v. Virginia*, the Court once again looked to foreign courts; and while only 13 years earlier our Supreme Court decided that decisions of foreign courts were not to enter into the determination of sentencing in the United States, the Supreme Court did the judicial flip-flop. Justice Stevens concluded in this case that there is a national consensus in reaching his opinion. Does this mean the end justifies the means?

In the footnotes explaining his decision, the Justices indicated they looked to briefs filed by religious groups, psychologists, polling data, and a brief offered by the European Union, a brief that was used eventually as blanket consensus, the voice of the global community at large. Well, what about the Constitution? Why not use the Constitution as our guide and only guide in making decisions by the Supreme Court?

But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most egregious perpetrator of citing foreign court opinions is Justice Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy continues to write decisions hardly based on the Constitution, but on international law. Which law is he beholden to? Is the Constitution not sufficient for him? In 2003, in a high-profile case involving my home State of Texas, the case of *Lawrence v. Texas*, Justice Kennedy referred to international standards in the Court's consideration of Texas laws. Revealing the Court's reliance on the views of a

wider civilization, the majority opinion was inspired by previous rulings of the European Court of Human Rights. Well, who put the European Court of Human Rights in charge of us?

This year, in *March, Roper v. Simmons*, writing for a 5-4 majority, Supreme Court Justice Kennedy wrote, we have established the propriety and affirmed the necessity of referring to the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society to determine what punishments are so disproportionate as to be cruel and unusual. In making this decision, the majority judges looked to foreign lands to interpret what cruel and unusual means in our Constitution. In dissenting, Justice Scalia, Chief Justice William Rehnquist, and Justice Thomas, on the other hand, said they do not believe that approval of other nations and people should buttress our commitment to American principles any more than disapproval by other nations and people should weaken that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the Constitution is an old document, well over 200 years; but this idea of "evolving standards of decency" is simply ridiculous. Values are timeless. American values are timeless. American standards are timeless, and they are in the Constitution.

The list of decisions against our Constitution, Mr. Speaker, is a deep cavern of vile destruction. Other verdicts handed down by the Supreme Court include citations of legal opinions from foreign courts in Jamaica, India, and the ultimate beacon of justice, Zimbabwe. Mr. Speaker, has the Supreme Court lost its way?

Let me give my colleagues an analogy. If, as a judge, I had a thief, a shoplifter appear before me who had stolen many times before and I ordered that his hand be chopped off in the public square, I suspect his attorney would object, saying, this violates the constitutional provision of cruel and unusual punishment in the eighth amendment. While the attorney would be correct based upon our Constitution, my response could well be, well, Mr. Lawyer, they chop hands off in other countries for this type of crime, so since other countries do it and they find it logical, I will accept these foreign courts in making my decisions.

Mr. Speaker, in Texas, I would have been removed from the bench for such nonsense. So why do we tolerate our Supreme Court using this same rationale going to foreign courts in their decisionmaking?

Mr. Speaker, these controversial decisions that have emerged from our Supreme Court have prompted a growing contingent of former judges in this body to join me in signing a letter to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I, along with my fellow gentlemen from Texas, (Mr. CARTER) (Mr. HALL) (Mr. GOHMERT), as well as the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr.

ADERHOLT), all former judges in their respective States, have urged our Senate colleagues to consider a nominee's allegiance to the United States Constitution and the sovereignty of the United States when imparting their advice and consent role in the Presidential appointment process in our Senate.

When any court in the United States, Mr. Speaker, begins to permit foreign sentiments to ooze into its rulings and opinions, it dangerously weakens our sovereignty. These irresponsible allowances erode our unique political identity and the sound traditions upon which American law is established. From the mere founding of our country, our laws and courts have respected and honored the sovereignty of the United States and the supremacy of our Constitution.

My colleagues will notice, Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing or criticizing the results of the Supreme Court decisions and their holdings.

□ 2215

I have been careful not to comment on the results of these numerous cases where the Supreme Court reaches out to foreign courts to make their decision. While somewhat relevant, since these decisions are the law of the land, the complaint is the process and method by which the Supreme Court makes decisions. The use of foreign courts, emotions, personal opinions, result-oriented decisions, personal agendas, feelings and the opinions of focus groups is, as Justice Scalia says, totally irrelevant. The only thing that matters is the Constitution.

Unfortunately, we now seem to have some jurists in our Supreme Court who have lost their way, their balance. They have forsaken the process founded by our forefathers. They are disregarding boundaries etched into the foundation of our Constitution.

Justice Scalia may be one of the last strongholds we have against judicial tyranny in today's Supreme Court. He understands the importance in honoring the original meaning of the constitution, that it is the supreme law of the land. He rightly maintains that foreign pronouncements are totally irrelevant when it comes to our courts and our Supreme Court in making their decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. It is an issue of who will stand with the Constitution and who will stand with foreign courts.

I urge my colleagues in both chambers to support measures that aim to curb the way our Supreme Court makes its decisions, that they should be responsible to the Constitution of the United States.

As Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, warned in an August 18, 1821, letter to a friend, Charles Hammond, a lawyer who argued before the Supreme Court, he says, that is Mr. Jefferson: The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government

is in the Federal judiciary, working like gravity by night and day, gaining a little today, a little tomorrow, advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall be usurped.

Mr. Jefferson was a prophet of what has become judicial anarchy. Some northeastern legal scholars, intellectual elites that sit in cigar-filled rooms agree with the ultimate decisions of the Supreme Court justices, justices that use these foreign laws, because they like the results.

But I warn these folks, the Supreme Court may not always make decisions you agree with, and they may betray you by ignoring the Constitution and citing foreign laws that create a different result than you wish. Then you will cry: Return to the Constitution; return to our sacred scripture. When your cries are made to our courts, you may too find no one is listening.

As guardians of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, as champions of the separation of power, as accountants of the system of checks and balances, as the stewards of this legislative branch, we must implore our judiciary, our Supreme Court justices to reject the seduction of comparable side glances as they interpret the laws of this land.

I ask the Supreme Court to come back home, home to the Constitution and reject the lustful temptation of foreign countries and their laws.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) such time as he must desire to speak on this very issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the judge, for the opportunity to say a few words about the future of this country, the history of this country and our beloved Constitution, and appreciate this opportunity to be here on this floor tonight.

As I watched the development here and the transition of history, and I am 55 years into this life, a little over a half a century, and I was raised with a deep and abiding love and respect for our Constitution and for the rule of law, the fact that a law existed meant that the judgment of the people had spoken. And according to the strong directive of my father, I was to then adhere to that law and adhere to that Constitution. And if I did not like the language that was there and the intent of the Constitution or the law, it was my job to step forward as a citizen of the United States and seek to change it; not to ignore it, not to amend it in a fashion that did not have the will of the people in support of it.

And so, today, Mr. Speaker, we have gone to this point where I look back upon this transition, this transition that has taken place over the 55 years of my life and the 45 or so years that I have paid attention to what is going on in the United States of America, and I have watched a dramatic transition take place within the judicial branch of government.

And I want to acknowledge at the beginning of this discussion, the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. POE) will know this, that I had the privilege to sit down and have lunch with a group of Supreme Court justices today, and I very much appreciate them and the other justices that joined them. It was a very, very good gesture on their part to reach out and open up a dialogue and give us an opportunity to speak about and discuss the disagreements that we have between the legislative branch and the judicial branch of government.

It is a natural tension that exists between these three branches of government, and this legislative branch of government, which clearly has its duties to write the laws; the executive branch of government which has its duties to execute those laws, enforce those laws; and the judicial branch of government whose job it is to interpret the laws, interpret the Constitution. It is a natural tension that exists, and it will go on as long as this is a great country. And it is a great country.

And I want to compliment the justices of the Supreme Court for being part of this effort to open the dialogue and give us an opportunity to discuss our differences. And I look forward to those opportunities to continue to sit down and have those discussions, and I will take advantage of that.

But I have to say here tonight that I have watched a transition over the last 55 years or so of my lifetime. And I would go back to a case that would be about 1963, *Murray v. Curlett*, and that was the case when Madeline Murray O'Hare became the most hated woman in America, and she successfully went to the United States Supreme Court and removed prayer from the public schools.

That, Mr. Speaker, I believe started us down the path, down the path of bowing to the judicial branch of government, maybe the last time that the American public really questioned and challenged the decisions that were made over across the street in the Supreme Court building.

This country has accepted those decisions because they believe that they do not understand the Constitution well enough to second guess a judge, and they do not understand the letter or the congressional intent of the law well enough to second guess a judge's decision to overturn the clear directive and intent of Congress. That has happened time after time after time.

And we have seen justice after justice reach out into foreign law, reach into foreign law to find a conclusion that suits their intent and their belief of how this country ought to be shaped and how it ought to be formed. *Murray v. Curlett*, prayer out of the public, schools started us down a slippery slope, a fast and slippery slide down into an abyss which I do not know how we swim out of it.

And I asked this question, and I have asked it of the Chief Justice directly, and that is, in case after case after case, we have seen decisions made by

which we cannot recognize the Constitution any longer. One of those cases would be the affirmative action cases that were before the Supreme Court I believe it was a year ago last April 19. And in those cases, I sat and listened to that. I went to hear profound constitutional arguments. And where would you go in the world to hear profound constitutional arguments except in the chambers of the United States Supreme Court? There is no higher calling and no higher standard for constitutional arguments.

And yet as I listened that day, I heard one, one constitutional argument, actually relatively profound. The case had to do with affirmative action. Chief Justice Scalia asked the question of the Michigan attorneys: If we rule against you and it results in one minority in your school, 100 percent minorities in your school or no minorities in your school, what possible constitutional difference can that make?

Now, the answer was long. But it was not clear. The question is clear to me. He directed that question directly back to the Constitution, which is where the entire oral argument should have focused. And yet it happens less and less as I hear these arguments before the Supreme Court because there is an entire industry that has been built up on trying to analyze the particular personal viewpoints of each of the justices. There is quite a history there to analyze, and quite an industry that has been built up around that.

But the arguments that go to the Constitution itself are ever diminished year by year, case by case, to the point where I believe that the courts have, because of *stare decisis*, because of the belief that once a decision is made, they should honor that decision of the previous court, not overturn the decision of the previous court. I could name you exceptions.

Stare decisis says that the Supreme Court is painting themselves into a legal corner. And on the other side of that room is the doorway back to the Constitution. But unless that paint dries, they cannot get back out the door. And as long as they respect *stare decisis*, this respect for a decision that is made by the previous decision of the court, the paint never dries, and they are trapped further and further into a corner that prohibits them from going back to the Constitution.

And so if you cannot get back to the Constitution, on what do you base your decisions? Well, foreign law. Foreign law is a nice and convenient decision that can be made. I have a list of some of these here, Mr. Speaker, and it is quite an interesting list. Justice Breyer, in his dissent, and I always give credit for dissent, *Knight v. Florida* 1999, A growing number of courts outside the United States courts that accept or assume the lawfulness of the death penalty have held that lengthy delay in administering a lawful death penalty renders ultimate execution inhuman, degrading or unusually cruel.

Sounds a lot like some of the language in our Constitution. But how could a lengthy delay in administering a death penalty change the ultimate result of that?

If locking someone up in prison for an extended period of time is cruel and inhuman, then would we not have to then release everyone that is in our prisons?

And in the case of *Pratt v. Attorney General of Jamaica*, for example, the privy council considered whether Jamaica lawfully could execute two prisoners held for 14 years after sentencing. The council noted that Jamaican law authorized the death penalty, and the United Nations Committee on Human Rights has written that capital punishment is not, *per se*, unlawful under the human rights covenant; Jamaican law, the United Nation's Committee on Human Rights.

And then the Supreme Court of India has held that an appellate court which itself has authority to sentence must take account of delay when deciding whether to impose the death penalty. This cited by the Supreme Court of the United States, Jamaican law, European, United Nations Committee on Human Rights, Indian law, the Supreme Court of Zimbabwe, and I quote, the Supreme Court of Zimbabwe, after surveying holdings of many foreign courts concluded that delays of 5 and 6 years were inordinate and constituted torture or inhumane or degrading punishment or other such treatment. Reference to the Zimbabwe law.

This proclivity for citing foreign law, when there is a clear directive to adhere to the Constitution and we have nothing else that directs us as Members of Congress as Members, of the executive branch who are sworn in or as Members of the United States Supreme Court, we take the same oath to the Constitution of the United States. And this Constitution is written and drafted and ratified by the people of this country. We shall never have another.

There is not another circumstance in history that could be reconstructed by anyone in this Chamber, by anyone in this city or anyone in this country that I know that could go back and say, well, if we lost this Constitution, we would just construct another one. We would find a way to get together in the blue zones and in the red zones of America, and we would draft up a Constitution that was living and breathing, and it would be a document that better fit the day of our age, and it would be something that would protect the interests of the minority against the tyranny of the majority, or the rights of the minority against the will of the majority. By the way, what protects the constitutional rights of the majority against the whims of the court?

And so, today, we have gone in my lifetime from a belief that this foundational document of the Constitution, which I carry in my pocket every single day, this Constitution that I be-

lieve is our covenant with our Founding Fathers, our guarantee of rights and our guarantee of freedom, that clearly spells out the responsibilities of each branch of government.

And, by the way, you can read this document through and through and through again. There is nothing in there that says separate but equal branches of government. It clearly lays out the responsibilities of each branch of government and, when read, gives the Congress the responsibility to be the final decision-maker on the courts themselves.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I propose that we, as a Congress, have an obligation, an obligation to defend this Constitution, an obligation to speak our minds when we disagree with the decisions of the court, but make a logical and a rational and a constitutional argument for our side, and call upon the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court to adhere to this Constitution, to adhere to their oath of office, to adhere to the laws of this land and to reject the directive that they might think they get when they travel to other lands, that intercedes with other ideas, other concepts, other cultures.

We separated ourselves from Great Britain for a good reason 200 and some years ago, and it was because we did not want to be Western Europe, and we did not want to be Jamaica, and we did not want to be Zimbabwe. We want to be a nation of free people, free people governed by a Constitution that a free people have ratified, not governed by foreign law.

And what is predictable about this foreign law? How can a citizen of this country aspire to move forward and invest capital and invest time and effort and build this future and be a good citizen of the United States of America when they do not know when a decision might come down from the Supreme Court that says, oops, there was a law over here in Zimbabwe; maybe there was a law in Ghana. Maybe there was a law in Costa Rica. Maybe there was a law in Russia, Israel, Belarus, anywhere.

□ 2230

How can we have predictability in our Constitution and our law if the courts can cite whatever, as the judge from Texas said, whatever might suit their whim of the moment?

So I believe we have to adhere back to this Constitution because we have migrated from its meaning. And even though the courts found in *Murray v. Curlett* that there was this separation of the church and State that was created there, took prayer out of the public schools. And by the way, I do not believe the Constitution calls for that for a minute. Once that decision was made and the letter of the Constitution and the intent of the Founding Fathers was ignored and we began to migrate away from the Constitution itself, we started down that slippery slope.

So is this Constitution what our Founding Fathers believed it should

be? Did the Framers draft this Constitution to protect the rights of the minority against the will of the majority, protect the rights of humanity against all forces whatsoever? They believed that this constitutional framework was for the gentleman and for me and for everyone in this country. But it has changed. And there are a number of people, in fact, I believe a growing number of people, that believe this Constitution no longer means what it says; that it is a living, breathing document, that nine Justices, a majority of nine Justices, five of them unaccountable to the people, should direct this society and this civilization.

But it is the vision of our Founding Fathers that those elected by the people should direct this examination and that the Judges should be ruling upon the letter and the intent of the Constitution, the letter and the intent of the law. And that is as far as it goes.

If this Constitution does not mean what it says, then what purpose does it have? It is either a living, breathing document that is flexible and can be malleable and can be shaped by any Justice that happens to have the good fortune to be appointed to the bench, or those words written on this document in my jacket are sacred and they are meant to be amended only by the people then whose description is in the Constitution itself.

It is a living, breathing document or we are originalists that believe in the original intent of this Constitution. If it is changed, if it is not, what it says, it means, then what does, Mr. Speaker, protect the rights of the minority against the will of the majority? What protects all of our rights as citizens? What preserves this great country if it can be shaped by the whim of the Judges?

This Constitution is either what I believe it is, and that is not a living, breathing document, but a document that is fixed for all time unless we amend it. And if it is not that, then the courts have turned it into an artifact of history, just a transitional document to get us from 1789 until today, where we could turn over the future of this country to the people in the robes that make those decisions. And if we do that, then we might as well board this place up and hand it over to the courts for their staff because there will not be any function for this legislature any longer.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution to this cause.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for his dedication to the Constitution, to making sure that the Members of this body are committed to that and reminding the Supreme Court that they have an obligation to that Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a former judge, a former appellate judge from east Texas. The east Texas folks kind

of think maybe a little differently than the Supreme Court does on using foreign law to make decisions that are binding on the rest of us. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), the former judge from Houston.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING). I thought those were very profound comments.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) mention something earlier and this was also touched on by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), but regarding the beginning of this Nation and how we had separated ourselves from Europe, particularly in the War For Independence that began with the 1776 Declaration of Independence and how we won that war and we separated ourselves. And then of course the Articles of Confederation did not work, and then 1789 we did have this wonderful Constitution.

I had also heard the gentleman say we won yet again, the battle with the British in the War of 1812. As the gentleman mentioned, here where we are standing and actually back in Statuary Hall as it is now, that was the old House Chamber and the British came up and they burned it, and actually the middle part burned. It was wooden. And the gentleman mentioned that we had defeated them. We ran them out after they burned much of Washington. I would like to expand on that.

I had thought, an old history major like me, I thought our American forces rallied and drove the British out in 1814 after they burned much of the town. But apparently the American forces were in such disarray they were in no situation where they could have allied and defeated the British at that time. We had some help at that point.

It turns out the night they set what is now Statuary Hall and the old Senate Chamber on fire, there was a big rain storm that came that put out the fire that kept the fire from completely destroying the building which left enough that they could work from afterward.

It was not American troops the next day and after that drove the British troops out. But as it turns out there was an incredible wind storm that arose. And it was of such force and such magnitude, it is given credit for killing 30 British troops. It knocked British cannons off their mounts. It created a great deal of confusion. It played a part in the accidental explosion of the British gunpowder statutes. It created such chaos the British fled on their own because of those acts of nature.

Well, as you know, insurance companies would call those acts of God, and I would tend to agree with them. Those were acts of God. I would like to think the Americans rallied. They could not do it. There was a higher power involved. But when we look at this issue, the gentleman took the oath to the Constitution. I took an oath to support

and defend the Constitution. I took that same oath when I went into the United States Army. I spent 4 years on active duty.

It is worth noting in a letter to Abigail Adams dated September 11, 1804, Thomas Jefferson was very concerned after the decision in *Marbury v. Madison*; he cautioned that judicial review would lead to a form of despotism. Judicial review is not a power explicitly granted in the U.S. Constitution. But in *Marbury v. Madison*, the court inferred this power based on the fact that Constitution is the supreme law of the land. But judges should always remember that the Constitution itself is the supreme law of this land and that each judge should never forget their oath to uphold the supreme law of the land and not be citing the law from other jurisdictions, from other lands that have nothing to do with our Constitution.

I tell you that Justice Scalia is an amazing intellect. In the *Roper v. Simmons* case, I do not take issue here with the outcome of the case, but for our purposes I would like to take issue and I think it is critical we take issue with the methodology in arriving at their opinion. And Justice Scalia did that in his dissent on behalf of himself and Chief Justice Rehnquist and also Justice Thomas.

He said this, this is just an excerpt, "In urging approval of a Constitution that gave life tenured judges the power to nullify laws enacted by the people's representative, Alexander Hamilton assured the citizens of New York that there was little risk in this since 'the judiciary has neither force nor will but merely judgment.'"

That is from the *Federalist No. 78*, page 465.

Hamilton had in mind a traditional judiciary "bound down by strict rules and precedents which served to define and point their duty in every particular case that comes before them."

Bound down indeed, says Scalia. What a mockery today's opinion makes of Hamilton's expectation, announcing the Court's conclusion that the meaning of our Constitution has changed over the past 15 years. Not, mind you, that this Court's decision 15 years ago was wrong, but that the Constitution has changed.

The Court reaches this implausible result by purporting to revert not to the original meaning of either amendment, but to "the evolved standards of decency" of our national society.

It then finds, and this is Scalia still talking, it then finds on a flimsiest of grounds that a national consensus which could not be perceived in our people's laws barely 15 years ago now solidly exists. Worst still, the Court says in so many words that what our people's laws say about the issue does not in the last analysis matter. This is Scalia still quoting:

"In the end our own judgment will be brought to bear on the question of acceptability of the death penalty under the eighth amendment."

Now, the Court has thus proclaimed itself the sole arbiter of our Nation's moral standards, and in the course of discharging that awesome responsibility, purports to take guidance from the views of foreign courts and legislatures. Because I do not believe that the meaning of our eighth amendment, any more than the meaning of other provisions of our Constitution should be determined by the subjective views of five members of this Court and like-minded foreigners, I dissent.

This is Justice Scalia.

Similarly, in *Roper*, Justice O'Connor called on the Court to substitute basically its own moral judgment for "the judgment of the nations' legislatures."

The majority, however, persists in imposing its will on the States and backs its decision up by citing the mandates of foreign legislatures.

The usurpation of the voice of the people began roughly with *New York v. Lochner*, and the word *Lochnerization* has since been used to describe cases in which the judiciary overrides the democratic law-making authority and imposes its own morality, or in some cases lack of morality, on the people.

Lochner was a 1905 case that has since been overruled; but in this case, the Supreme Court told the New York legislature it could not regulate certain items.

So this usurpation continued with *Roe v. Wade* and again most recently in *Lawrence v. Texas*.

Now, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had mentioned, there was a very nice lunch today. And the Supreme Court was very gracious in reaching out and having members of the Committee on the Judiciary. There were Senators. There were some of us from the House Committee on the Judiciary. There was a few staff members. And we heard from Justice Stevens, Justice O'Connor, Justice Breyer, Justice Kennedy and Justice Souter.

I would say those are very, very hard-working, well-meaning Justices. But good intentions are not enough. We know from history itself when we think about the words "this means peace in our time," Chamberlain had the best of intentions. He meant well. He thought he was doing what was best for the world, and what he was doing was giving homage and helping a tyrant like Hitler. And so good intentions simply are not enough.

□ 2245

That oath must be upheld. So that is why I do take issue with the rationale in these cases. These are fine judges, but they have gone astray when they venture out beyond their oath and neglect that from which they have sworn to uphold.

If I might, one of the most frustrating things in this body has been the way people can play fast and loose with what is real, absolute truth. The Constitution is truth. The Constitution does not change. It should not just go

flittering here and there, depending on the whims of the Court.

Just like I heard prior to us coming in, the prior presentation about Social Security, and I could not help but note when there was talk of, well, in 2017 these old Republicans, they are talking about it is going bankrupt, and that is just all a facade of sorts, basically paraphrasing. Then the words were said, but it is actually in 2017 when there is more cash going out than comes in. We fall back on these trillions of dollars that are in cash bonds that will continue to earn interest. Cash sounds like there is cash there. There is nothing there. There are IOUs. There are Federal IOUs, and to say they will continue to draw interest, they stick more IOUs in there and say there is your interest. That is just so disingenuous. It is so misleading, and even though I really believe those people saying those things have the best of intentions, they are doing great harm to the Nation by misleading.

In the same way, the Court has the best of intentions. They mean well. They think they are doing this great service. They go to the different seminars and they speak in different places, and they hear these different things from other people who maybe look down on our laws for this or our laws for that. That has nothing to do with our Constitution.

I really appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) yielding to me to say some of these things that are so overwhelming in my heart and soul, as I look to the days ahead. I know they trouble my colleague greatly and I know that both of us came from the same school, if you are going to legislate, by golly, take off the robe, come off the bench, run for the legislature and if, God willing, you get elected, then you can come legislate. I agreed with you on that. We did the same thing. We are here, and hopefully America will help bring the justices back to reality, and the reality is they took an oath to support and defend the Constitution.

So I appreciate that time, and let me just say, there has been a lot of misleading information saying that some people, by their comments, they are doing great harm and inciting violence. I tell you what, as a judge I know you were tough and I was, too. Anybody that threatens, attempts to use force, attempts to use violence of any kind, they need to go to prison when it comes to our courts.

That is why we are pushing the bill to make the sentences even tougher for anybody that is involved in that, but by golly, our Constitution promised us that First Amendment right to freedom of speech. Neither the Supreme Court nor anybody else should restrict what the Constitution and the Bill of Rights has granted to us. God willing, they will not and America will not let them do it in a nonviolent way.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

GOHMERT) for his kind words and for his insight into this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, as most Americans go about being concerned about jobs, Social Security, the environment, health care, crime, outsourcing, all of those things are important. Many of those issues will eventually end up in our courts. Some of those cases will find their way to the Supreme Court, and while this issue is somewhat complex, it is not that difficult to understand.

The Constitution is the Bible for our democracy. Words mean something, Mr. Speaker, and the words of the Constitution are words that we must live by, that we must stand by and that we must defend.

I hope that most Americans, regardless of who they are, what their political beliefs are, understand that our Constitution came about because of sacrifices of Americans, many of whom we will never know the names of, that fought first in the War of Independence and numerous wars after that, because we are a unique land, Mr. Speaker. We are a unique people, Mr. Speaker, and the pinnacle of our uniqueness is the Constitution of the United States.

Every public official in this country, school board members, police officers, city councilmen, firefighters, members of the State legislatures, judges throughout our entire Nation and Members of this body took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. That is who our oath and our allegiance is made to, and all we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the Supreme Court come back home, follow their oath, be beholden to the United States Constitution and not to foreign countries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical emergency.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and May 11 on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise

and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and May 11 and 12.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, May 16 and 17.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, May 11.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and May 11 and 12.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, May 11 and 12.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, May 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and May 11 and 12.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 148. An act to establish a United States Boxing Commission to administer the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce; in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to the subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 11, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1911. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Removal of Regulated Areas [Docket No. 05-011-1] received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1912. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — West Indian Fruit Fly; Regulated Articles [Docket No. 04-127-1] received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1913. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; California [Docket No. 05-010-1] received April 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1914. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commuted Traveltime [Docket No. 04-108-1] received April 1, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1915. A letter from the Regulatory Contact, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Export Inspection and Weighing Waiver for High Quality Specialty Grains Transported in Containers (RIN: 0580-AA87) received April 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1916. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2005-2006 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV05-985-1 FR] received March 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1917. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fluid Milk Promotion Order [Docket No. DA-04-04] received March 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1918. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment [Docket No. LS-04-09] received March 28, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1919. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Transition Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AH30) received April 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1920. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting in accordance with the provisions of Section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2017), Section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5875), and Section 108 of the Inspector General Act of 1988 (31 U.S.C. 105(a)(25)), proposed legislation which authorizes appropriations for FY 2006; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1921. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 096-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1922. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Iraq (Transmittal No. DDTC 001-05), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1923. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1924. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1925. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1926. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State,

transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1927. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1928. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1929. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1930. A letter from the Presidential Appointments Officer, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1931. A letter from the Director of Government Affairs, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting a report documenting the Endowment's FY 2004 usage of Category Rating Human Resource flexibility, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3319(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1932. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting the FY 2004 Annual Program Performance Report, prepared in accordance with the provisions of The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1933. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Upper Mississippi River, Fort Madison, Iowa [CGD08-05-018] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 5, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1934. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Use of Locomotive Horns at Highway-Rail Grade Crossings [Docket No. FRA-1999-6439, Notice No. 16] (RIN: 2130-AA71) received April 29, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1935. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Frivolous Arguments regarding Waiver of Social Security Benefits Used to Avoid Tax (Rev. Rul. 2005-17) received March 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1936. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2005-23) received March 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1937. A letter from the Acting Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Time and Manner of Making Section 163(d)(4)(B) Election to Treat Qualified Dividend Income as Investment Income [TD 9191] (RIN: 1545-BD16) received March 22, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1037. A bill to make technical corrections to title 17, United States Code (Rept. 109-75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GINGREY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 268. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1279) to amend title 18, United States Code, to reduce violent gang crime and protect law-abiding citizens and communities from violent criminals, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-76). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 269. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1544) to provide faster and smarter funding for first responders, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-77). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 2207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for the support of full-service community schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 2208. A bill to amend the Exchange Rates and International Economic Policy Coordination Act of 1988 to clarify the definition of manipulation with respect to currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2209. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare an annual report specifying the number of permanent and temporary non-Federal employees for local offices of the Farm Service Agency that will be needed to efficiently and effectively handle the workload generated by recurring and anticipated agriculture programs administered by the Farm Service Agency and the funding levels necessary to support such workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 2210. A bill to require combination 3-point safety belts on certain school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BASS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2211. A bill to limit liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for service station dealers with respect to the release or threatened release of recycled oil; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2212. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Trinexapac-Ethyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2213. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on formulations of Prosuluron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2214. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on formulations of triasulfuron and dicamba; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2215. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on formulations of triasulfuron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 2216. A bill to develop and deploy technologies to defeat Internet jamming; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2217. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to confirm the Consumer Product Safety Commission's jurisdiction over child safety devices for handguns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2218. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the fee for collecting specimens for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 2219. A bill to ensure that, during time of war and in another country, the United States does not detain a United States citizen unless the United States first ensures that the citizen's fundamental rights to information, counsel, and communication are protected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2220. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pontamine Green 2B; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2221. A bill to extend the duty suspension on Mesamoll; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2222. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bayderm Bottom 10 UD; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2223. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bayderm Finish DLH; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2224. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Levagard DMPP; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2225. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bayderm Bottom DLV; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2226. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2227. A bill to extend the duty suspension on ortho-phenylphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 2228. A bill to extend the duty suspension on Iminodisuccinate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 2229. A bill to amend title 36 of the United States Code to ensure that memorials commemorating the service of the United States Armed Forces may contain religious symbols, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2230. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to reduce the incidence of child injury and death occurring inside or outside of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 2231. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 2232. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide minimum mandatory penalties for certain public-corruption-related offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H.R. 2233. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the availability of benefits under an employer's nonqualified deferred compensation plans in the event that any of the employer's defined pension plans are subjected to a distress or PBGC termination in connection with bankruptcy reorganization or a conversion to a cash balance plan, to provide appropriate funding restrictions in connection with the maintenance of nonqualified deferred compensation plans, and to provide for appropriate disclosure with respect to nonqualified deferred compensation plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H.R. 2234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make health information technology grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2235. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to safeguard public health and provide to consumers food that is safe, unadulterated, and honestly presented; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2236. A bill to establish a comprehensive program to ensure the safety of food products intended for human consumption

which are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2237. A bill to help protect the public against the threat of chemical attacks; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KIND, Mr. REYES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2238. A bill to establish a grant program to provide comprehensive eye examinations and necessary follow up treatment to children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 2239. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the recognition period for built-in gains for subchapter S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 2240. A bill to provide assistance for the development of indoor disease prevention and health promotion centers in urban and rural areas throughout the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 2241. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Lewatit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 2242. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain ion-exchange resins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 2243. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2,6 Dichlorotoluene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 2244. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Glyoxylic Acid 50%; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 2245. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on paraChlorophenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER:

H.R. 2246. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on allethrin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. WATT):

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 230th anniversary of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, which was the first proclamation issued by American colonists calling for complete separation of the American colonies from the British Crown; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. Res. 270. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 303) to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit cer-

tain additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation for the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation and to eliminate the phase-in period under current law with respect to such concurrent receipt; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas introduced a bill (H.R. 2247) for the relief of Jen-Hui Tsai; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 23: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 36: Mr. BERRY, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 37: Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 98: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 127: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 128: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 136: Mr. HALL and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 176: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 190: Mr. COX.

H.R. 197: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 278: Mr. GINGREY.

H.R. 280: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 282: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WU, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GONZALES, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 292: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 302: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 328: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 373: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 389: Mr. POE.

H.R. 438: Mr. CARDOZA.

H.R. 530: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 533: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 554: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 556: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 558: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 581: Mr. OWENS and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 676: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 759: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 762: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 763: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 778: Mr. COX.

H.R. 791: Ms. LEE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HERSETH, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 800: Mr. KIND, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MICA, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 807: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 810: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 819: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 820: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 867: Mr. OWENS and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 869: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 880: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 917: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 920: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 937: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FAITAH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 946: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 952: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 988: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 997: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 999: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1002: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1020: Mr. SCHWARTZ of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1029: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1125: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1139: Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 1150: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1153: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 1157: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1166: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1184: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1204: Ms. SOLIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1222: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1225: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1226: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H.R. 1237: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1246: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1262: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1276: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 1293: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1300: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1307: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1310: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1316: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. POE.

H.R. 1351: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1355: Mr. CARTER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CONWAY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1357: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1373: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1379: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOYLE, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 1380: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 1390: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1409: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1424: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1426: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1428: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1445: Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1474: Mr. WU and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1492: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1498: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. NEY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1499: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1505: Mr. CAMP, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. CANNON.

- H.R. 1508: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 1509: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1510: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 1526: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1547: Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 1554: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1575: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1578: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 1591: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 1592: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1602: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1620: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1633: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. REYES, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1664: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1671: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1678: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 1688: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1690: Mr. OLVER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1696: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SABO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1707: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 1708: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 1736: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 1746: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 1751: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 1770: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas and Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 1776: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COX, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 1806: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1816: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. HOSTETTTLER.
H.R. 1849: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1872: Mr. GUTKNECHT and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1898: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 1985: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2018: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 2037: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2045: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOSTETTTLER, Mr. VISLOSKEY, and Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 2049: Mr. GOODE and Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 2073: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2074: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2087: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SABO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2122: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 2131: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 2134: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2184: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 2193: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2205: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.J. Res. 7: Mr. WICKER.
H.J. Res. 10: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. RENZI, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. BACA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CAROLIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. LEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. HEFLEY.
H. Con. Res. 71: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Con. Res. 76: Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. FILNER and Mr. PORTER.
H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. WEINER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. REYES, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASE, Mr. FARR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. GORDON, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BERKLEY, and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KIND, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H. Res. 116: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 121: Mr. BOREN
H. Res. 123: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H. Res. 142: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H. Res. 146: Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. HOSTETTTLER.
H. Res. 245: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BACA.
H. Res. 251: Mr. COSTA, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H. Res. 252: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H. Res. 266: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mrs. MCCARTHY.